INDIA.

EDITED BY H. MORSE STEPHENS, M.A.
BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD,
LECTURER ON INDIAN HISTORY AT CAMBRIDGE.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

VOL. IV., No. 9. (NEW SERIES.) SEPTEMBER 1, 1893. SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus"	257
The Riots in Bombay	263
The Mysore Parliament	265
The Indian Universities	266
The Application of Political Economy to India	267
Mr. D. E. Wacha on Indian Hoards of Silver	269
DOCUMENTS: The Indians in South Africa	270
Mr. Naoroji and His Constituents	271
Mr. Caine and the Opium Commission	271
Petitions in Favour of Simultaneous Examinations	272
INDIA'S NEEDS: Sir C. Dilke on the Recent Memorandum	273
AN UNMOVED MOTION: A Talk with Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P.	275
THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA, by A. O. Hume, C.B.	277
REVIEWS: Campbell's Memoirs	279
A Great Lieutenant-Governor	282
Indian Political Law	283
THE VOICE OF INDIA: Selections from the Indian Press	284
THE VOICE OF BRITAIN ON INDIA: Selections from the British Press on Indian Matters	286
GOSSIP: About Persons and Books	288
BIBLIOGRAPHY: Of Articles in Monthly and Quarterly Magazines on Indian Subjects	288
Of Books on Indian Subjects	288

Indiana.

I note with pleasure that the Mahárájá of Darbhangah has, by the unanimous votes of the non-official members of the Bengal Council, been recommended to represent his province in the Viceroy's Council under the new scheme.

In another column will be found an interesting letter, which Sir C. Dilke has addressed to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, containing notes and comments on the various proposals compiled by some members of Parliament interested in Indian affairs, for discussion on the Indian Budget.

My readers will find elsewhere an explanation of the accident of procedure which prevented Sir W. Wedderburn from moving, on August 11th, his resolution for a commission of inquiry into the military and the civil expenditure of India. Sir W. Wedderburn has been good enough to indicate in an "interview" the lines which his speech would have followed. Meantime, discussion is reserved until the Indian Budget comes on for consideration—it is to be hoped, therefore, until the Autumn sittings. "I am not as yet able," wrote Mr. Gladstone on June 8th, "to give any pledge bearing on the "date of the discussion, but I feel with you that "even if it be to impose a further sacrifice, adequate "time ought to be found for it."

The recent riots in Bombay have attracted a good deal of attention in England, and the usual moral which the critics have drawn from them has been that there is increasing need of firm government in India by the representatives of Great Britain. The better moral, as is shown more fully in another column, is that there is need for prompt and strict inquiry into the circumstances which gave rise to the disturbances. Sir W. Wedderburn raised the right point, therefore, in the question which he asked in the House of Commons on August 28th. The question ran as follows:

"To ask the Under Secretary of State for India whether the Secretary of State for India will lay upon the table of the House the reports received by him from the Government of India with regard to the recent riots at Azamgarh, Ballia, Rangoon, Bombay, and other places in India between Hindus and Mussulmans:

"And whether he will direct the Government of India to appoint a mixed Commission of official and non-official members to investigate the causes of such riots and report on the best means to be adopted to remove these causes."

The exponents of the policy *Divide et Impera*, have of late been busily engaged, both in the Indian and in the British press, upon the task of demonstrating that Hindus and Mussulmans are bitterly at variance on the subject of simultaneous examinations. In view of this charitable endeavour on the part of men

who ought to know better, it is pleasant to read in the *Muhammadan Observer* an account of a great meeting of Mussulmans held at Calcutta on July 16th in support of the proposed reform. From an article printed on good Mussulman green one gathers that the meeting—it was the general meeting of the Calcutta Muhammadan Union—was crowded, and that the following resolution was enthusiastically carried :—

"That this meeting is of opinion that we, Mussulmans, have perfect sympathy with the proposal of holding Indian Civil Service Examinations simultaneously in India and in England, and that it is our duty to support it."

The resolution was moved in a very sensible speech by Moulvi Muhammad Shams-u-Zoha. He had, of course, no difficulty in showing the absurdity of the assumption that, under the system of simultaneous examinations, the service would be flooded with Hindus. The assumption seems to be based on the notion that Europeans would cease to compete, and that such Hindus as were successful in the preliminary examination would not be required to spend a certain period in England. As for the Mussulmans, their most promising youths are, the speaker urged, not the "aristocrats," but the sons of parents who, under the present system, cannot afford to send them over to England on the off chance of their passing the examination. Establish a simultaneous examination in India, and you open the door to these candidates. Besides—and this is a point which some Allahábád, Calcutta, and London newspapers seem to forget—the Mussulman is not a dog in the manger. "This," said Moulvi Muhammad Shams-u-Zoha, "appears to "be a most mean and ungenerous position. We "ought to fight with the Hindus in the University "arena and not allow them to carry off all appoint- "ments in the Civil Service."

The *Times* thought it worth while to print, on August 9th, a communication from its correspondent at Simla giving the substance—such as it was—of an article published in the *Pioneer* with the view of discounting the demand for simultaneous examinations to the Civil Services. The folly of this precious "exposure" is the measure of our opponents' weakness. They do not, for they cannot, deny that meetings have been held in India approving the recent resolution of the House of Commons. They do not deny that the meetings have been numerous, crowded, enthusiastic. But they urge, if you please, that they have been "simply organised under direc- "tions from London," that they are, in short, the work of that wicked Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and that, therefore, they mean nothing at all. "The "whole agitation is," said the wiseacre who represents the *Times* at Simla, with a final flourish "artificial, and is merely the work of the Congress "wirepullers obeying Mr. Naoroji's detailed instruc- "tions. The value of the petitions likely to be pre- "sented to Parliament may now be judged."

Now, one does not look to correspondents of the *Times* for a sense of humour, but really this Knight of the Scissors at Simla might have been expected to think twice before he telegraphed this cutting to Printing House Square. Will he kindly explain how, on his theory, it happens that Mr. Naoroji has material to work upon? As our first Indian M.P. remarked, with caustic moderation, in his reply to the *Times*, "it will be, I think, admitted by every- "one that, unless there is a strong feeling really "existing, it is quite impossible to hold large and "enthusiastic meetings all over the country." In the last analysis, of course, the *Pioneer's* "exposure" is a general attack upon political organisations. Some political organisations are, no doubt, not strikingly creditable. For example, I am no great admirer of the Primrose League, which is a little apt to mistake free sandwiches and bottled beer for legitimate argument at a general election. But to denounce at large the machinery by which public opinion is constitutionally formulated is simply ridiculous, and the *Times* ought to have known better than give prominence to so silly a criticism.

Besides, in the case in question, public meetings were held in India to express satisfaction at the success of Mr. Paul's resolution long before any "instructions" from Mr. Naoroji arrived. The electricity that flashed the good news across the world set popular enthusiasm immediately on fire. For twenty years and more the native population of India have begged the Government to establish simultaneous examinations. The National Congress has put forth the request annually since its foundation. If these facts do not satisfy the *Pioneer*, let it issue "instructions" to Mr. Naoroji's "wirepullers" and their victims to hold demonstrations against the resolution. It will then be in a position to write about "artificial agitation". Mr. Naoroji, by the way, sent to the *Times* a copy of the offending letter. But there are letters and letters; and Mr. Naoroji's letter was not printed in the *Times*.

For a typical instance of the meetings which have been held I am indebted to the *Bombay Gazette* (Overland Summary). It was a meeting held on July 15th in the hall of the Framjee Cowasjee Institute. According to the *Gazette*, "there was a very large "attendance, and the capacity of the hall was strained "to the utmost." Mr. R. M. Sayani, the well-known Muhammadan, proposed the adoption of a memorial

to the House of Commons in regard to simultaneous examinations, and his remarks upon the duration of the demand are worth remembering:—

"So far back as the Christian year 1868 the East India Association had presented a memorial to the Secretary of State for India, praying for the holding of simultaneous examinations, and the late Professor Fawcett had in the same year placed on the motion book of the House of Commons a notice to the same effect. Indeed, the British Government had been pledged to the principle of the resolution both by its promises and by the declarations of its enlightened and liberal-minded statesmen for more than half a century, from the days of Peel and Mackintosh, of Macaulay and Lansdowne, to those of Bright and Fawcett."

Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, I am glad to see, called attention in the speech which he delivered at the great meeting held in Calcutta on July 12th, to a gross error that has obtained currency in regard to the opinions of the Hindu members of the Public Service Commission. The statement has been made that these gentlemen concurred in the opinion of the other members against a system of simultaneous examination. But this is a mistake, as Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter showed by reference to page 52 of the Report. "The members of the Commission "named in the margin do not" the passage runs, "share in the apprehensions expressed above as to "the probable result of the introduction of an ex-"amination in India for the Covenanted Civil "Service, simultaneous with the examination in "England, and they wish it to be noted that they "have not deemed it necessary either to state at "length the arguments in support of this view they "have taken, or to meet the objections raised "against it, as the scheme which is now unani-"mously recommended by the Commission is, in "their opinion, well calculated to secure the end "they have in view." The names referred to were those of the Honourable Romesh Chunder Mitter, Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, and Rái Bahádur Krishnají Laksman Nulkar.

My readers will be glad to learn that Mr. H. W. Paul, M.P., has given a conditional promise to contribute to the October issue of INDIA an article on the resolution recently adopted by the House of Commons in favour of the system of simultaneous examinations to the Civil Services.

The appointment of Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., to be one of the members of the Opium Commission will be welcomed by all impartial observers in India, as it has been in England. The report was current in London for some time during the past month that Mr. Caine had been objected to by the Government, and that the Commission, therefore, would not receive the benefit of his special knowledge. The fact that this report proved to be false is a feather in the cap of the Government. The appointment will, doubtless, provoke surprise among many worthy officials in India, and ex-officials out of it, who are saturated with the belief that all such juries as the Opium Commission should be packed either with creatures of the bureaucracy or Jo-Hukum-Wallahs—their very humble and obedient servants. The Liberal Government, on the contrary, have killed two birds with one stone by securing the services of Mr. Caine and by showing themselves superior to the mandates of relentless officialism.

SIR WILFRED LAWSON TO W. S. CAINE, M.P., ON HIS LEAVING FOR INDIA ON THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

(Cf., HOR. Odes I, iii:—"*Ad navem qua vehebatur Virgilius Athenas proficiscens.*")

"Hail to the Caine who in triumph advances,
Foes at his onslaught may shudder and shrink;
They may shoulder their muskets and level their lances,
But woe to their opium, and ganja, and drink!

"They may talk of the taxes they're bound to collect,
They may argue and mystify—all is in vain.
Nothing is left for these men to expect
When in battle they're faced by the terrible Caine.

"Then let the Commission proceed through the land,
Gathering truth as advancing it goes;
Helping the Government firmly to stand
Against all the myriad Philistine foes.

"Come in your thousands then, meet the Commissioners,
Come from the mountain, the valley, the plain,
Be for your country the patriot missioners,
Speaking the truth to Commissioner Caine.

"Heed not the Blue Books they throw at his head,
Heed not the stories they tell to decry him.
Can they refute all the facts he has said?
Can't he defend himself? Only just try him.

"Then success to the band of Commissioners trusted
To find out the truth o'er the breadth of the land;
Don't let your minds and your talents lie rusted,
Say what you know to the Caine and his band!

"House of Commons,
"August 21st, 1893."

Lord Kimberley's statement that the expense of the Opium Commission is to fall half upon the

Indian revenue and half upon the British Treasury can hardly be received with unmixed satisfaction. The Pickwick Club cordially recognised the principle of every member of the corresponding society defraying his own travelling expenses, and considered their proposal to pay the postage of their letters, and the carriage of their parcels "worthy of the great minds from which it emanated." Now, the Opium Commission, in the form which it will take, is not by any means a concession to Indian requests. As Lord Stanley of Alderley remarked when he put his question to Lord Kimberley, it has not been asked for by the India Office or by the Government or the people of India. On the contrary, it is purely British in origin, and designed to apply healing balm to British consciences. What India wants, and must soon have, is a Commission of experts to inquire into the extravagant expenditure which is annually incurred in her name, though not always for her benefit.

In these circumstances, since England has called the tune, she ought certainly to pay the piper. It was not without reason that the British Indian Association protested the other day that India cannot afford the loss of opium revenue while no other source of income is found to supply its place. Why, therefore, should India pay half the cost of an investigation which will leave her most pressing financial problems untouched? Once more we have to be content with small mercies. Where the pecuniary interests of England and of India come into collision India usually goes to the wall. It is something, therefore, that she will not in this instance be called upon to find the whole cost. Another crumb of consolation may perhaps be extracted from the fact that, as England will pay half, there will be at least some scrutiny in the House of Commons of expenses which will fall in part upon India, and anything which, even indirectly, encourages this practice is so far a thing to be welcomed.

In this connection it may be worth while to recall the sensible remarks used by the writer of "Indian Affairs" in the *Times* of August 22nd:—"We trust "that the idea of saddling India with the cost of "the Opium Commission has been abandoned. That "Commission is being issued for the sole purpose of "satisfying tender consciences in Great Britain, and "we hope that Parliament will itself honourably "defray the cost of its philanthropic impulses. We "heartily concur in the sentiments expressed on "the subject by the secretary of the Anti-Opium "Society. It is difficult for the British public to "realise the bitterness with which the Indian Press "regards the practice of throwing such charges upon "the Indian taxpayer; or the damage done thereby to "the fair name of England. A custom is growing "up according to which, whenever a group of curious "or benevolent gentlemen in Parliament want to "know something about India, special machinery "is instituted at the cost of the Indian Exchequer "to satisfy their thirst for knowledge."

I hear from Mr. Prithwis Chandra Rai Chowdhary of Calcutta, that he has prepared a translation of Bankim Chandra Chattarji's well-known novel, "Krishna Kanta's Will." Sir William Hunter in his summary of Bengali literature, in his "Indian "Empire" states that that novelist's "Durgesa "Nandini" has never been surpassed. The novel Sir William mentions was Chattarji's first and most popular work, but for pourtraying of character and literary style many good judges consider "Krishna "Kanta's Will" to be its superior. Two novels of this popular Bengali writer have already been translated into English; "The Poison Tree," by Miss Knight, and "Kapála Kundala" by Mr. H. A. D. Phillips, who has lately been more conspicuous for his conduct in the Maimansingh scandal than for his services to literature. The translator has kindly submitted to me a portion of his work which seems to be well worthy of serious attention.

Under the title of "Haidarábád in 1890 and "1891" the Haidarábád correspondent of that vigorously edited paper *The Hindu* has published his letters contributed to that paper in the years mentioned. It makes a singularly interesting little volume. Haidarábád is the premier Native State of India. The majority of its inhabitants are Hindus, while the Nizam is a Muhammadan. The result is that the Government is utterly opposed to the tendencies of the people of the State. The correspondent to *The Hindu* naturally watched with some suspicion the conduct of the Nizam's Muhammadan Government. This of itself gives a character of severe criticism to his comments on Haidarábád affairs. It is well that more light should be thrown upon the internal administration of the great Native States. Mr. Tupper in a volume reviewed in the present number of India has treated the question from the scientific and general point of view. The Haidarábád correspondent of *The Hindu* gives us the local gossip and details of a typical administration.

The correspondent from Bangalore, commenting on the article in India for June on "Slavery in Assam," observes that there are a good many coffee estates in Mysore, but that there are no slave dealers or coolie recruiters there. This is a noteworthy point, and a

question might well be asked in the House of Commons why, if special laws are necessary to obtain labour in Assam, they are not necessary in Mysore. The planters in both parts of India need labour, but in the Native State they do not apply to the legislature to supply it for them. Perhaps the conditions may vary somewhat, but nevertheless I am exceedingly obliged to my Bangalore correspondent for his pertinent observation. He tells me also that the next Mysore Representative Assembly is to meet on or about 20th October. It need hardly be said that its proceedings will be watched with as much interest as those of its predecessors.

Considerable excitement seems to have been caused among the legal practitioners in Káthiáwár by the notification of the Political Agent requiring them and the authorised translators to pay an annual fee of thirty rupees and fifteen rupees respectively. A deputation of the classes affected appeared before the Judicial Assistant to complain of the new regulation. The Judicial Assistant remarked: "I myself "had nothing to do with it. The notification came "upon me as suddenly as upon the Bar. I knew "nothing about it till I saw it published." It seems very curious that the Political Agent should adopt such a measure without consulting the judicial authority. Apart from the question of legality or expediency it is nothing short of an outrage on the legal profession of Kathiawar, that such a measure should be adopted suddenly without giving time to those affected to protest, and without consulting the judges before whom they practise.

Dr. Bhalchandra Krishna, President of the Bombay Medical Union, has published an address he delivered before the Union on April 13th, with an appendix containing his recent correspondence with Dr. Gray, the Principal of the Grant Medical College at Bombay. I have no intention of entering into the merits of the dispute which, if it does nothing else, proves the ardour of the Bombay native medical men in the study of their profession. Dr. Bhalchandra regrets "the present, and let us hope only temporary, entanglement between the native and European members of the profession," and uses conciliatory, though not apologetic, language. It does seem preposterous that Dr. Gray should have refused to allow the use of the theatre for lectures to the proposed post-graduate classes. It would have been expected that he would only have been too glad to encourage the desire of the Bombay doctors to complete their professional education.

The opposition of the white population of British South Africa to the immigration of their Indian fellow-subjects of the Queen seems to be increasing. I print two petitions which have been drawn up and signed on this subject, and they have naturally excited much animadversion among the Indian community. A spirited public meeting was held on June 14th at Kimberley, and a petition to Sir Henry Lock, which I also print, was adopted for circulation and signature. The chairman of the meeting, Mr. H. O. Ally, made an eloquent speech, from the report of which in the *Diamond Fields Advertiser* I extract the following sentence, which contains the pith of the matter. "Hailing," he said, "from a country where they were quite satisfied "with the rule of Her Majesty the Empress of "India—(applause)—they were entitled to the same "privileges and rights in this country as anyone "else. Europeans were to be found in all parts of "India carrying on large businesses, but the Indians "never interfered with them. Why then should "Europeans in this colony interfere with British "Indian merchants here?"

In regard to the proposal for the complete separation of Judicial and Executive functions in India, it would be interesting to learn from Lord Kimberley who it is that advises the India Office that no reform is possible? The public have surely a right to know who it is that is trying behind the scenes to keep up a monstrous system which tends to make England and English officers hated and dreaded by the native community. Who is the dark spirit that shuts out the light from the eyes of the Secretary of State?

At least two passages from a recent article, published in the *Times*, on "Indian Affairs" seem to deserve some notice here. In one of them the writer expostulates with "gentlemen of the House "of Commons" on the language they thought fit to employ during the debate on the Indian currency. "Such epithets as 'spoliation,' 'public plunder,' "'flagrant act of public plunder," and the other "missiles of vituperation hurled across the floor by "the speakers on Mr. Chaplin's motion, are as un-"patriotic as they are unjust. If any native "journalist in India had used those expressions he "would have raised a tempest of indignation in the "Anglo-Indian Press, and he might, under a less "sensible Viceroy than Lord Lansdowne have "attracted the attention of the Public Prosecutor."

Nor is this all. By way of putting the dots on the i's the writer adds that "the most unsparing "of the vernacular journalists would have been "ashamed to have stated the case in such outra-

"geously extravagant language as that which was "used by Parliamentary orators on the 8th of this "month; by men who know and care little about "India, except as a stalking horse from behind "which to attack the political party opposed to "them."

In the other passage the writer of "Indian Affairs" admits candidly enough that the organisation of the Indian National Congress is strong and effective. He says: "On the one hand, there is a small, able, "and eloquent class, highly educated on Western "methods, and powerfully organised for purposes of "agitation (using that word in no ungenerous sense). "This class knows perfectly well what it wants—a "share in the direct control of the government, and "not merely a share in the administration—and it "understands how to express its want in an effective "manner." I suggest that the adjective "small" is, in this passage, a slip of the pen. It should have been "large and increasing."

The inscription on the statue of Mr. Bradlaugh, which is now being executed at Doulton's works, Lambeth, and which is to be erected in Abington Square, Northampton, is to be as follows: "Thorough "Charles Bradlaugh. Born 26 September, 1833. "Died 30 January, 1891. M.P. for Northampton, '1880–91. Four times elected to one Parliament "in vindication of the rights of constituencies. A "sincere friend of the people, his life was devoted "to progress, liberty, and justice. India chose him "as her representative, and mourns his loss." It is expected that some of the supporters of the Indian National Congress will be present when the statue is unveiled.

The courtesy of opponents of India's native claims is not less evident than their reasonableness. The *Times* published, at the close of July, some "charac-"teristic passages" from a screed sent to it by "a "native of India." The passages are "charac-"teristic" enough to be worth reproducing here:—

"The so-called 'Indian National Congress,' hatched by intrigue on the part of the Brahmin for his self-aggrandisement, though a mere show, yet works out, with the aid of the undue and misplaced sympathies of the English nation, complications to end in no small danger to the liberties of the helpless millions of India. Ignorant of the actual situation of things in India, the English nation figure a dupe here—to the very great discredit to their understanding; and, unable in their pitiable ignorance to value at their true worth the misrepresentations on the part of the Brahmin, lend themselves an apt tool in his hands and carry out with their might his designs to enslave the people to his malignant ambition. To turn to the matter demanding the most urgent attention at the present moment. The people are threatened with the thraldom of slavery, oppression, and tyranny to result from the extirpation of British civilians and their substitution by the Brahmins; and the anxieties of the people know no end now. I therefore sincerely trust that it will surely please my most gracious Sovereign in her mercy, justice, and truth to avert the dire calamity from the land, and to save 300 millions of India by directing the retention, in its original purity, of the organisation of British civilians who have ever proved themselves noble and impartial administrators of justice and also guardians of liberty, freedom, and equality to the people."

The "British civilians" are to be congratulated upon winning the applause of so acute a critic.

The precious scheme by which Government officials in India are to be allowed to remit to Europe one-half of their salaries at a privileged rate of eighteenpence per rupee was reported with unconscious irony in a telegram to the *Times*. "The "allowance will, in fact, be an addition to the "salary," and, the *Times* continued, "the members "of the services seem to be satisfied." And satisfied they ought to be. Goodness knows their salaries were substantial enough before; but if the Government felt that some hardship had been caused in individual cases by what is called "the fall of the "rupee," the sensible and obvious course was to make gratuities to the individuals concerned. Instead of that, a wholesale readjustment is effected in the system, a large and permanent addition is made to salaries all round, and a new demand is enforced upon the purse of the poorest country in the world. A pretty scheme, this—reminding one of nothing so much as the wisdom of the Chinaman who burnt his house in order to roast his pig!

The *Spectator* published recently a somewhat remarkable article, of which the main thesis was that the "tone of Empire" is on the wane among the British people. "No thoughtful man" it wrote, "however little he may be disposed by temperament "to applaud the extravagances of Jingoism, can "help feeling some alarm at the very visible decline "of the ruling sentiment in this nation." I confess to having been troubled by no such apprehensions, for the simple reason that I have perceived no adequate cause for them. Nor, after reading the *Spectator*, am I convinced. Yet it appears that the indications which cause alarm to thoughtful persons are capable of fairly exact classification. In the upper and middle classes the relaxation of the ruling temper takes, we are told, the form of "a sudden awaken-"ing to the worth of the finer graces of character "and endowment—to the attractions of art and "beauty and refinement on the one hand, and to the "power of gentleness and sympathy and kindness "on the other." This is very sad, but the masses are in still worse plight. "Lower down in the "social scale," the *Spectator* says, "the spirit we "are analysing seems to fluctuate between a crude "sentimental humanitarianism and the selfishness "which is unable to rise above the petty interests "of the moment to a sense of what is national or "imperial."

How very shocking, to be sure! And what degenerate days these must be upon which we have fallen! Yet somehow, when one reads a jeremiad of this kind, he is apt to imagine that it has been written by a nice old gentleman, in a nice old library, to the tune of carpet slippers and a good cigar. What, after all, do the lamentations come to? The nice old gentleman's spirit is chafed by "the Home Rule movement" and by "schemes for "entrusting India to the government of Baboos." Perhaps it does not occur to him that we are not where we were in the thirties, that our institutions have been somehow a little democratised—in a word, that the affairs of the British Empire are gradually ceasing to be administered by Jingoes for Jingoes. Is it so deplorable a circumstance if we are coming to abandon Thrasymachus's view that justice is the interest of the stronger, and learning that the duty of governors is to minister to the welfare of the governed?

Fidus.

⁂ With the issue of the present number, Mr. H. Morse Stephens, M.A., ceases to be editor of India. On his resignation the editorship has been transferred to Mr. Gordon Hewart, B.A., formerly Scholar of University College, Oxford.

THE RIOTS IN BOMBAY.

The columns of the British press have lately teemed with statements, and criticisms founded upon the statements, in regard to the religious riots in Bombay. Perhaps, in these days of "over-coloured and over-voluminous narrative," this was to be expected, and we need not be much surprised if the positiveness of the criticisms has, as usual, been in direct proportion to the critic's lack of information. But, if cautious observers prefer to await more adequate intelligence before committing themselves to uncompromising judgments, it is none the less true that upon certain broad aspects of the question some conclusions are immediately possible. The coincidence of a Hindu festival with a Mussulman prayer-day seems to have supplied a spark which ignited a good deal of inflammable material. The fire spread, and in a significantly brief time attained the dimensions of something like a conflagration. Moreover, the phenomenon itself was by no means a novelty, however remarkable the proportions which it assumed. In these circumstances the obvious question is, what made the material inflammable? The occasion is manifest. Is the cause manifest also? Before attempting to answer the question it may be worth while to glance at some answers which have already been given. The opinion of the *Times* possessed at any rate the elementary virtue of promptness. "For these riots, and for the excesses with which they have been marked it seems certain" we were told on August 14th, "that some unusual causes must have been at work. Nor is it difficult to discover what these causes may have been. There has been of late a strong religious revival among the Hindus, and it has taken a remarkable form. Their sacred animal is the cow, and since Muhammadans kill cows without scruple, occasion has been taken by fanatical Hindu missionaries to stir up among their people the feelings of anger and indignation which such an offence is thought to warrant." Hindu fanaticism—that is the diagnosis of the *Times*. It has only one disadvantage, but that is a serious one. It is, in the Aristotelian phrase, at variance with notorious facts. It was not yesterday, nor the day before, that the Hindu began to regard the cow as a sacred animal. Everybody who knows anything at all about India knows that the belief is one of long standing, and has caused many previous collisions. With all deference to the *Times*, therefore, we can hardly dismiss the matter with the airy assumption that there has been a sudden outbreak of inconvenient fanaticism on the part of Hindu missionaries. The *Daily News* was of opinion that the riots had "sprung from a cause which to Western notions at any rate is the most trifling, the conjunction, in time, between the festivities, or the periodical rites, of opposing religions." Unfortunately, this judgment has nothing to say to the special intensity which these particular riots seem to have reached. The *Manchester Guardian* was hardly more precise, though its article had the merit of bringing out the fact that there are "enlightened Hindus and enlightened Muhammadans who have more or less come together on a common platform of Indian reform." It cannot too often be repeated that these religious conflicts, which cause disorder and bloodshed among sections of the masses of the people, are certainly not encouraged by intelligent and educated men, among either Hindus or Mussulmans. The *Daily Chronicle*, however, thanks to the good offices of a correspondent, was able at least to mention another explanation—namely, "the belief that prevails in certain circles in India, first, that the Government is inclined to pet the Mussulman element at the expense of the Hindu element, and, second, that this petting is part of a general policy of 'dividing and ruling'."

To ascertain the truth or the falsehood of this belief is, it seems to us, one of the most important tasks which the whole question involves. Is it or is it not the case that officials in India have, for what they may regard as purposes of Imperial policy, departed from the strictly impartial course in dealing with religious differences among the teeming population of that vast continent? No prudent observer will venture to answer such a question off-hand. First he will collect evidence and, having collected, will weigh it. Reasons for thinking that no such "petting" policy exists are, doubtless, manifest. It is difficult to believe that the representatives of Great Britain in India could stoop to a policy so indescribably mean and so indescribably perilous. The *Daily Chronicle* said that it "seems unlikely, for Parliament would make short work of any action in India so directly calculated to cause bloodshed." The argument would be more convincing if it were based upon a less transparent fallacy. Existing or not existing, the "petting" policy has never been said to

be known to the Imperial Parliament. The *Daily Chronicle's* correspondent stated plainly enough "there can be no doubt—no independent observer who has lived in India during the last few years can deny it—that there is a widespread conviction that the Government policy is all in the direction of favouring Muhammadans at the expense of Hindus." A specific example of the prevalence of the belief is to be found in the explanation contained in the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* for July 5th, of occurrences at Bareilly. Hitherto, we are told, Mussulmans were allowed to sacrifice cows in three public slaughter-houses beyond the municipal jurisdiction of Bareilly town. This year some Mussulmans demanded "as a right" permission to sacrifice cows in private houses within the municipality. The magistrate decided that they had no such right, but granted permission in six cases. Both parties appealed to the Commissioner, who decided that the Mussulmans had a prescriptive customary right to private sacrifices, and directed the present magistrate to make inquiry. The latter accordingly selected more new places of sacrifice, to the greater annoyance of the Hindus. Then, continues the *Patrika*, "the low-class Mussulmans thought that they had the support of the authorities on their side, and they began to desecrate the Hindu sanctuaries and pollute the waters of Hindu wells by throwing pieces of beef into them. Then large carcases of bullocks were carried in open carts through lanes and bye-lanes in Hindu quarters. The Hindus, unable to bear the outrages, closed their shops." Here, at any rate, we have a tolerably definite allegation of supreme maladroitness if not partiality on the side of the officials. And we may well ask, in view of the considerable tumult at Bombay, how far the Government concern themselves, by rigid impartiality, by good-humoured concession, and by general tact, to foster unity among the various sections of the people. Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., expresses a valuable opinion on this point in an article which he has contributed to the September number of the *New Review*. "I have," he writes, "been carefully observing Bombay affairs since I left India in 1887, and I fear that the present Government of Bombay is not in touch with the people. This seems to be shown in many ways—for example, by their attitude towards higher education and the Congress movement, their treatment of the Rajabai Tower Case, and their disregard for public opinion in framing Rules under the Indian Councils Amendment Act. And it is currently believed that some of his Excellency's leading advisers are tainted with the pernicious doctrine of 'Divide and Rule,' an idea ruinous to our position in India, and irreconcileable with our declared policy of justice and impartiality. To countenance such a doctrine for a moment, to contemplate resting our authority upon discord, to show favour or disfavour according to race or creed, is assuredly the direct and certain way of producing the perilous mischiefs we are now deploring."

What is abundantly clear is that there is a case for full and immediate inquiry into the causes of the recent disturbances. Sir William Wedderburn quotes, in the article to which we have referred, the statement of an Indian correspondent that "these disputes are increasing in number and intensity, and causing a wide breach between the two communities." The securely judging orb of the universe is apt to infer that men intend the natural consequences of their acts. Is the conduct of officials in India conducive to harmony or to discord among the native population? We find it difficult to believe that it is as conducive to harmony as it might well be. The *Times* was not content with ascribing the riots in Bombay to a special outburst of fanaticism on the part of the Hindus. It must needs go out of its way to associate with that fanaticism the demand for simultaneous examinations to the Civil Services. "The Muhammadan," it said, "can never forget that his race and creed were once dominant in India. To the rule of the stranger he can submit, but to be under subjection to those who were his subjects in old days is more than he can patiently endure. This, however, is the result which the modern system of competitive examinations is now tending to bring about. It is a system suited to the Hindu, whose pliant nature allows him to adapt himself to the circumstances amid which his lot is cast, and who has the kind of cleverness which serves him well at an examination, little qualified as he may be to fulfil the duties of the post which he can thus gain. The Muhammadan is of a different stamp, better fitted to govern." And so forth, and so on, until we are told that "the Indian Congress, too, has been almost entirely a Hindu movement." Perhaps it behoves us to be grateful that the *Times* did not bluntly state that the Bombay riots were organised under private instructions from the British Committee. The article is a good example of the disuniting and thoroughly unstatesmanlike temper—precisely the temper of which complaint is made. To exalt the Mussulman, to sneer at the Hindu, to mis-state facts in regard to the Indian National Congress—this is a policy from which no good can come, and from which, if it be persisted in, grave peril must ensue. "Nobody shall persuade me," said Burke, "when a whole people are concerned, that acts of lenity are not means of conciliation;" and, again, "the natural effect of fidelity, clemency, kindness in governors is peace, good will, order, and esteem in the governed." These are the maxims that deserve to find a more prominent place in the handbook of the Indian official, and to oust the baneful maxim "Divide et Impera," commonly said to have originated in India under Lord Dufferin's rule. "The question with me," that we may quote again from the same source of stately wisdom, "is not whether you have a right to render your people miserable, but whether it is not to your interest to make them happy. It is not what a lawyer tells me I may do, but what humanity, reason, and justice tell me I ought to do. I am not determining a point of law; I am restoring tranquillity, and the general character and situation of a people must determine what sort of government is fitted for them. I am not here going into the distinctions of rights, not attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not enter into these metaphysical distinctions. I hate the very sound of them. This is the true touchstone of all theories which regard man and the affairs of man: does it suit his nature in general?—does it suit his

nature as modified by his habits?" It is these sentiments, and sentiments like these, that mark the true ruler. We will not insult the intelligence of our readers by elaborating the obvious contrast between such a spirit and the spirit which loves cast-iron formulas, thinks much of martial strength and little of conciliation, is concerned to exaggerate points of difference and overlook opportunities of agreement, and consistently pours water upon the people's aspirations and contempt upon their representatives. *Non sic fortis Etruria crevit.*

THE MYSORE PARLIAMENT.

In the first number of the present series of India there was an article on the Mysore Representative Assembly. At that time I had only before me newspaper reports which were excellent in their way, but did not pretend to give a complete account of the sayings and doings of the Mysore deputies. I have now received the official publication describing the work of the Assembly. It is entitled the *Proceedings of the Assembly of Representative Rayats and Merchants of the Province of Mysore*. Of course it is impossible to expect from a distinctly official report the lively details which alone make parliamentary proceedings interesting reading. The little scene, for instance, which I quoted from the report in the *Mysore Herald* finds no place in this official publication, and there is no attempt to give a verbatim report of the debates that took place. The *Proceedings* are to be compared rather to the journal of the House of Commons than with Hansard's debates, and it must be confessed that the greater part of it forms uncommonly dull reading for those unacquainted with Mysore. Every local demand for a woodyard or a well is reported with the same fullness as important administrative questions. Every local complaint which is brought before the Assembly is noted with the Diwan's reply, and important as local questions are to the localities interested it is difficult without local knowledge to get up an enthusiasm over them. But the Mahárájá's Government has done wisely to print these *Proceedings* in their present form. It is not compiled for the use of the general reader, but is distinctly intended as a business-like exposition of what was said and done during the session of the Assembly.

The twelfth Mysore Representative Assembly, which was held from 4th to 8th October, 1892, was the second since the introduction of the elective system. The figures given as to the number of qualified electors are calculated to disillusion those who might fancy that Mysore was on its way to become a democratic state. The electors are all those who pay in taxes not less than 100 rupees a year, and under this regulation 2,616 persons were returned as qualified to become members of the Assembly. Of this number 1,039 persons attended, and elected 332 members. It seems from these figures that a Reform Bill will soon be needed in Mysore, for it will be noticed that one in eight of the qualified individuals were elected deputies, and one in three of those who took the trouble to vote. This seems rather a *reductio ad absurdum* of the representative ideal, but things were not very much better in England in the last century; and it may fairly be expected that as education, and especially as political education progresses, the franchise will be lowered, and a more thoroughly adequate representative body elected. In addition to the elected deputies, associations recognised by the Mysore Government, such as the Planters' Associations, etc., deputed seven members. The total number of members returned was 339, but four of these having been elected by more than one body of electors, the actual number of members was 335, of whom 303 attended the Assembly. The names of all members are given in an appendix. Most of them seem to have been connected with the land, but there is a fair sprinkling of merchants, lawyers, and money lenders.

The proceedings opened with the annual address of the Diwan Sir K. Sheshadri Iyer, which resembles the administration report for a British province. Then came the discussion of the various points brought up by the members of the Assembly. Perhaps the most interesting of these was the question of an improvement of the procedure to be followed in the Assembly which was brought up by the Rev. Mr. Haigh, member for Mysore city. A short summary of the discussion on this subject is given, at the conclusion of which the Diwan remarked "that "there were members who did not understand "modern methods of conducting discussion meet- "ings, such as the order to be observed, holding "up hands to denote approval, etc., and that in "dealing with them those who were endeavouring "to get up a standing committee should have pro- "ceeded with great caution, eschewing observations "in English." Among other points of the discussion on the need of some regulation for the preservation of game it was stated that antelopes were becoming extinct, and one native member desired "that peacocks, held by the Hindus to be sacred, "should be specially protected." Sir Richard Garth would be interested in the discussion which took place on the separation of judicial from executive functions. The Diwan replied, much like Lord Kimberley in the House of Lords, "the suggestion "is good, but there is difficulty in giving effect to "it." There was a long and interesting discussion on a Draft Bill which had been circulated among the members upon Village Courts, which practically dealt with the qualifications of the Patels for legal work. Among petty points should be noticed a request that Government should defray the expense of "prayers for rain," to which the Diwan replied acutely that "Bráhmans are morally bound to offer "such prayers;" and a request that the village astrologer should be treated as a village officer, to which the Diwan replied that "the services of the "astrologer are no longer required."

These are but a few points noted down from the *Proceedings of the Assembly*. But enough has been said to show that the deputies take their position seriously, and can do something more than merely appeal for help for local public works. The elected Mysore Representative Assembly is one of the most interesting features in modern India, and what can be done in one Native State could likewise be done, if the will were only there, in British districts and

provinces. Of course the experiment is still in its infancy, but its growth has been rapid, and every year a greater importance will be attached to it. The Mysore Parliament is still far from possessing the power exercised by Parliaments in European countries, and it will be long possibly before it can take an active part in reviewing the administration. But the very fact of its existence proves the advance of the people of India in political education, and if the Mysore Parliament is carefully steered it will steadily grow in usefulness to the people. Mr. Viraraghava Chariar, B.A., in a little dialogue which he published at Madras in 1891, called the "Mysore "Representative Assembly and the Indian National "Congress," exactly touches the present importance of the experiment. He perceives that it is early days yet to give the Assembly legislative authority or power to control the executive. Its chief value at present is that it brings the representatives of the people directly in contact with the Government. To quote from his dialogue. He makes an inhabitant of British India say:

"Shabash! is it even so? Then these representa-"tives can put a great many questions to the Diwan; "and not a single want or grievance need escape "his attention, since everyone of them can be com-"municated to him direct by the members of the "Assembly?"

To this the Mysorean replies:

"That is just what the members of the Assembly "do. And what better object can the administration "of a State have than to hear complaints directly "from the people and give redress. If the people's "grievances are heard, and if there is an honest "endeavour to redress them, the first and primary "object of a Government is served."

THE INDIAN UNIVERSITIES.

HAVE the Indian Universities done, or are they doing, a good work? This is the question set before me by a learned Bengali gentleman, who earnestly entreats me to attack the subject. His letter is too long to be printed in full in the pages of INDIA, but the considerations he sets forward deserve to be carefully examined. It need hardly be said that his indictment of the Indian University system is not inspired by any opposition to the cause of higher education. But he argues that the present system is fatal to the proper development of the Indian intellect. I will quote a few sentences from his letter as a theme on which to make a few comments. They will at least prove how thoroughly he believes in the strength of his case, and he has many supporters among the more thoughtful members of Indian society.

"Under the huge Juggernaut of our examining "universities," he says, "the manhood of an entire "nation is being crushed out of it, and, in return, "our brains are crammed with a world of unneces-"sary, distasteful, and ill-digested knowledge. The "university degrees serve us in good stead in life, "no doubt, but kill us for all serious occupations. "The examinations as conducted by our universities "are insults to our understanding and outrages upon "our intelligence. Everybody knows that the vagaries "of an Indian examiner are ten times more mis-"chievous than those of a District Officer. It is not "very rare that unsuccessful candidates commit "suicide in India. In England, where examina-"tions are congenial to the soil, and where teaching "and examining universities flourish side by side, "the evils are counteracted by a home influence, "general enlightenment, and public opinion. In "India they have scarcely any redeeming features. "We have transplanted bodily the rules and the "law of the University of London into India, and "we must not be surprised if an exotic has lived to "prove only a upas tree amongst us. And heaven "alone knows if we can ever rise as a nation under "those circumstances. Let us analyse our gains and "losses. We receive a vast amount of crude and "unorganised knowledge, transmitted to us through "a language not our own, which we do not know "how to make use of to our profit, and which "secures us, let it be mentioned in all fairness, "appointments in this or that service. This crude "knowledge, which sets upon us as a heavy burden, "costs us our health, the energy of our manhood, "and the healthy and beneficent influence of our "old-world family organisation; it unmakes us for "the race of life and taxes to an unconscionable "extent our memory and our intelligence. For "passing examinations is one thing, getting edu-"cated quite another."

The language is strong, and it is not too strong under the circumstances. Higher education in India is unfortunately entirely controlled by the standard of the university examinations. The remedy which the writer I have quoted advocates is the establishment of teaching universities in the place of examining universities. He does not contest the good work done by the Indian colleges, but he mourns over the fact that learning in India is not cultivated for its own sake, but only as a path to official employment or professional success. In a pamphlet published in Calcutta in 1888, entitled "Higher Education in Bengal and the University of Calcutta," by a Native Philomath, a keen regret is expressed for the absorption of the old Sanskrit *tols* by the modern high schools and colleges. In ancient days India was remarkable for its successful pursuit of many branches of knowledge. Grammar, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and philosophy, were studied with exceptional fervour and marked success. Nowadays, the Indian press teems with abridgements of European text books and handbooks to European science. Whether or not it be the fact that the Indian universities are the source of this degeneration it is impossible for an Englishman to judge. But Indian opinion, as represented by many distinguished graduates, attributes the evil mainly to the existing system of university examination. The complaint is one which has been heard often enough in England. A bitter cry is constantly going up that English undergraduates only come up to the universities to get a degree with a minimum of education, and that university professors and college tutors have their enthusiasm deadened by the need of contracting their teaching to the demands of the various examinations.

Endowment of research and endowment of learning are again and again asserted to be as much the function of the older English universities as the work of getting undergraduates through the specified tests, and the educated Indian who mourns over the neglect of cultivating knowledge for its own sake, will find similar grumblers at Oxford and at Cambridge. Well may the writer of the pamphlet referred to compare the mediæval European universities with the Sanskrit *tols* of his native land. But the same relentless course of evolution has, to a large extent, new-modelled the older universities of England and the Continent, as well as the Indian educational system. But the evil is not the less an evil because it is almost universal, and those educational reformers in England who desire to draw Oxford and Cambridge into line with the modern educational system should take heed lest they utterly extinguish the higher duties of those renowned universities.

In these days, when the Government of India and the Provincial Governments are credited with a desire to stint the expenditure upon higher education in India, it behoves everyone who has the interests of modern India at heart to do his best to defend the cause at issue. There is a general impression abroad that Indian higher education has done more harm than good. It is asserted that the character of the people has suffered, and those who hate higher education, because of its preparing Indians competently to fill important positions, veil their real reason under the argument that it has produced moral degeneration. If a Native Philomath and his friends are right it is not higher education, but the Indian university system which is to be blamed. They plead for a teaching university in the great capitals of India. Such establishments might do much to prevent the prevalence of mere cramming which undoubtedly exists, but they would run the danger of becoming mere cramming factories themselves. If professors at Indian colleges cram their pupils for university examinations, the fact of their being university professors would not necessarily turn them into a different order of beings. It is not with any desire of depreciating the value of teaching universities that I say this, but because the war against mere cram must be fought by changing not the titles of the teachers, but the spirit of the teaching. How this can be done is a problem which is exercising the best intellects in Europe, and it is satisfactory to observe that it is doing the same thing in India.

A Native Philomath argues that cramming has a worse effect in India than elsewhere. "The most "serious intellectual malady of the present age," he says, "throughout the civilised world is cramming, "and nowhere is it more dangerous than in Bengal. "Cramming is more than a hasty review of studies, "as it is generally meant in English and American "universities; it is getting a thing by rote, as is "prevalent on this side of India, without understanding it or digesting its truth, and this is "evidently the product of competitive examinations, "and of the compulsory study by students of a "variety of subjects. The competitive examinations in Bengal are driving thoroughness away "from the province, and are sowing the seeds of "flippancy and shallowness all over its wide area. "True scholarship is dying off, and ignorance in "the shape of self-conceit is selling dearly in the "market. Soundness of learning is now held at a "discount, and superficial acquaintance with knowledge is at a premium." This is a serious indictment, and the Government which has arrogated to itself the entire direction of Indian education must look to it that higher education should be watched and improved, and not allowed either to be starved by poverty or stifled by cramming.

THE APPLICATION OF POLITICAL ECONOMY TO INDIA.

THE recent legislation of the Government of India upon the silver question has caused English political economists of all schools to write a great deal of rather verbose criticism on the application of political economy to India. This is not the place to back up the attack which is being made from many quarters on the old-fashioned system of orthodox economics. The ideas of the group of men who insisted that political economy was a positive science have been riddled through and through. In Europe different schools of Socialists utterly deny the basis on which the orthodox edifice was erected. It is generally acknowledged that the facts of human existence modify all abstract rules which pretend to govern the production and the distribution of wealth. Nothing that is concerned with the life of men in society, whether it be called politics or ethics or economics, can be reduced to cut and dried rules. The infinite variety of the conditions and circumstances of human life prevent the possibility of laying down as certain or final any laws as governing the relations of men with one another. The orthodox economists who believed that they dealt with a science as positive as any of those embraced in the ring of the mathematical and physical sciences are now discredited, and their successors feel it necessary to qualify their statements in such numerous respects as to entirely destroy the title of political economy to be considered a science at all.

Since this is so in Europe and America, where political economy is now recognized as being very tentative in its nature, special care should be taken to avoid applying even these tentative conclusions to India. The laws which govern existence in India are so utterly different to those existing in Europe and America that the very greatest care must be taken in guarding against applying the assumptions justified in one quarter of the world to another which differs from it so greatly. One of the wisest thinkers in India, the Ráo Bahádur Mahadeo Govind Ranade, C.I.E., has treated this question at some length in a lecture which he delivered at the Deccan College, Poona, in 1892. This masterly lecture is reprinted in the first series of the "Deccan College Lectures," which has recently been published by Mr. V. Kalyanaram Iyer at Madras. Mr. Ranade calls his lecture "Some Indian Aspects of Political Economy." It is not enough to call this lecture masterly, it is simply impossible for anyone who has studied it to

fall into the pitfall of applying modern economic ideas to India. The perfect mastery which Mr. Ranade possesses, alike of the works of modern political economists and of modern writers on social and political topics, would have drawn to this lecture, if it had been published in an English magazine, universal and admiring attention. As it is no writer on Indian economics is justified in neglecting it. Mr. Ranade is naturally influenced by the speculations of Sir Henry Maine and Sir Alfred Lyall, but he nevertheless maintains an independent position, and while applying their dogmata to economic questions does not fail to make use of his great advantage as an Indian in interpreting Indian characteristics.

At an early stage in his lecture he draws attention to the remarkable antithesis which exists between England and India and which destroys the power of arguing from the conditions in the one country to the conditions in the other. "In India," he says, "the average individual man is to a large extent "the very antipodes of the economical man. The "family and the caste are more powerful in the "individual in determining his position in life. "Self interest in the shape of the desire of wealth is "not absent, but it is not the only nor the principal "motor. The pursuit of wealth is not the only ideal "aimed at. There is neither the desire nor the "aptitude for free and unlimited competition, except "within certain predetermined grooves or groups. "Custom and state regulation are far more powerful "than competition, and status more decisive in its "influence than contract. Neither capital nor labour "is mobile, nor enterprising nor intelligent enough "to shift from place to place. Wages and profits "are fixed, and not elastic and responsive to change." These facts, put with such admirable conciseness by Mr. Ranade, are well enough known, but writers on Indian questions, and more especially on Indian economics, are apt to forget them. The ordinary English newspaper when discussing questions of Indian trade and finance or taking part in the perpetual controversy on the wealth or poverty of India, nearly invariably forgets that the conditions are so wholly different, that the ordinary ideas applicable to England are simply absurd when used in regard to India. The stock arguments of the political economists are based on the conception that the accumulation of wealth is the mainspring of national life, and its measurement the test of national prosperity. Adam Smith destroyed the fallacy that money means wealth; he did not conceive of a nation in which wealth in its broadest sense was neither the main object of life nor the chief agent in social and political life. All the numerous arguments upon the distribution of wealth, the wages fund, the margin of rent, must be essentially modified when applied to India.

Having proved this point up to the hilt, Mr. Ranade proceeds to analyse the ideas of the broader economic teachers whose economics have been modified by the use of the historical and comparative method and by the new Socialistic ideas. Then taking political economy in its widest sense as a branch of sociology, he shows that even then it needs still further qualification before it can be usefully applied to the circumstances of India. "The "characteristics of our social life," he repeats, "are "the prevalence of status over contract, of combina- "tion over competition. Our habits of mind are "conservative to a fault. The aptitudes of climate "and soil facilitate the production of raw materials. "Labour is cheap and plentiful, but unsteady, un- "thrifty, and unskilled. Capital is scarce, immobile, "and un-enterprising. Co-operation on a large "scale of either capital or labour is unknown. "Agriculture is the chief support of nearly the "whole population, and this agriculture is carried "on under conditions of uncertain rain-fall. Com- "merce and manufactures on a large scale are but "recent importations, and all industry is carried on "upon the system of petty farming, retail dealing, "and jobworking, by poor people on borrowed "capital. There is an almost complete absence of a "landed gentry or wealthy middle-class. The land "is a monopoly of the State. The desire for accumu- "lation is very weak, peace and security having "been almost unknown over large areas for any "length of time till within the last century. Our "laws and institutions favour a low standard of life "and encourage sub-division and not concentration "of wealth. The religious ideals of life condemn "the ardent pursuit of wealth as a mistake to be "avoided as far as possible. There are old legacies "and inherited conditions. Stagnation and depend- "ence, depression and poverty—these are written in "broad characters on the face of the land and its "people."

These forcible considerations should have their weight in the economic policy of the Government of India. The futility of attempting to regulate taxation on a European basis becomes obvious when the difference in the nature of the case is thus made clear. Arguments about currency which are plausible enough for England and America have not a shadow of possibility when applied to India. European economists, with their knowledge of the extraordinary power possessed by European governments for new financial expedients, cannot understand that these expedients cannot possibly be adopted in India. There is no means of tapping the reserved capital, or in other words the hoards, of the people of India. Capital there must be in the country, but where it is or how it is to be reached no Indian administrator can tell. Consequently Indian public works are constructed by English capital, and India is impoverished to pay the interest. Those who know, like the writer on "Indian Affairs" in the *Times* for August 22nd, assert that the only possible taxes that can be increased in India are the Salt Tax and the Income Tax, and it is generally admitted that these are already only too severe. Where, then, can increased revenue be obtained? Mr. Ranade does not attempt to tell us. But his exposition of the difference between European and Indian economic conditions shows that the question cannot be approached by the light of existing European experience.

It is most valuable knowledge that Mr. Ranade has imparted to us. Much of what he has said has been said before in a more diffuse manner, but he has applied the knowledge of the overwhelming contrast between Europe and India to political economy

in a striking and lucid fashion. Those who would solve the problems of Indian economics must begin by forgetting all that they have learned of European political economy even in its widest and most extended and most modern developments.

MR. D. E. WACHA ON INDIAN HOARDS OF SILVER.

That well-known journalist, Mr. D. E. Wacha, has published in the *Times of India* an admirable reply to Mr. O'Conor's strictures on Indian hoards. I have not space to give the whole letter, and content myself with extracting the most essential paragraphs.

The recent letter of Mr. O'Conor in the columns of the *Pioneer* on the vexed subject of the hoarding of silver in this country is doubly welcome at this juncture, firstly, on account of its official character, and secondly, on account of the speculations in which it abounds. Highly interesting as the latter are, their utility for purposes of popular instruction may be doubted, based as they are, on hypotheses which are not only slender, but open to question. From the statistics quoted, Mr. O'Conor would lead the public to infer that it was an exaggeration to speak of the existence of "vast hoards" of silver, coined and uncoined. That there exists hoards of rupees to a moderate extent he is ready to acknowledge, but that India could have at all accumulated uncoined silver, either in the shape of bullion or ornaments, to a larger extent than 30 crores during the past fifty years he is not disposed to postulate. He quotes statistics to disprove the popular belief. And it may be therefore useful, in the first instance, to examine the accuracy of his figures. Having given close attention to this question for a number of years, I may say I am fully aware of the statistics to which he refers. They are well-known to students of finance. Moreover, they were submitted by the India Office before two Royal Commissions, namely, the one which sat in 1884 to investigate the causes of depression of trade and industry, and the one which sat in 1886 to inquire into the question of currency reform. It seems, too, that in his zeal to disprove the case of the vast hoarding, as alleged by Mr. Schmidt and others, including the editor of the *Statist*, who is the *bete noirs* of the Financial Department of the Government of India, Mr. O'Conor has strangely omitted to take into consideration the figures of the net imports of silver and the total amount of new silver coined from 1835 to 1855. When the statistics embraced by this period are taken into account, it will be perceived that they give quite a different complexion to his thesis. . . . .

I beg, Sir, to rivet the attention of the public to the *one* broad fact revealed by the several statistics, from 1835 to 1890. That in spite of the silver imported during the sixty-five years, India had to encroach upon the hoards accumulated by her *prior to* 1835 to the extent of three crores for coinage! This fact entirely contradicts the statement regarding the existence of a surplus of uncoined silver amounting to thirty crores. They simply exist in Mr. O'Conor's imagination. Not only did the state absorb every ounce of imported silver from 1835 to 1890 for purposes of coinage, but actually encroached upon the old hoard, accumulated prior to 1835, to the value of three crores. . . . .

I think, Sir, I have now adduced sufficient testimony to demonstrate the fallacious character of Mr. O'Conor's statement that there are no vast hoards of bullion in this country. His own chief, Sir David Barbour, to the best of his information, averred before the Royal Currency Commission that India had hoarded immense quantities of silver *in all forms during the previous centuries* and that *in addition to those hoards*, which have hardly been destroyed, the value of that hoarded *since* 1835 equals in value at the very least 130 millions sterling, that is to say, according to Dr. Soetbeer's rough calculation one-sixth of the total circulation in the world. Or if gold and silver be taken together, it would be one-third!

I ask, Sir, whether or not the above amount is "vast" enough? And is it not colossal in its magnitude, though, compared with the population, the proportion may look small. Is Mr. O'Conor prepared to say that these hoards have no existence? And if they have existence, is he further prepared to say that those possessing them are not sufferers by the artificial raising of the value of the current rupee? It may be that the Government of India now endeavours to minimise the extent of the loss entailed on the population possessing this hoarded silver by declaring that there is in reality so little of silver bullion left that it could not be over thirty crores, conveniently neglecting the hoards prior to 1835, which have been admitted on all hands, and by none more than the present Finance Minister. But surely, if it be not the object of an official of the high character and position of Mr. O'Conor to mislead the public, then I cannot understand the real *raison d'être* of his letter to the *Pioneer*. Neither am I able to understand the recantation of the theory of hoarding by Sir David Barbour. If any two officers of the State are fully conversant with the question, it is they. But it has now become a difficult matter whether the public could safely rely on their solemn utterances, when in the case of the one all statistics go against him, and in the case of the other all previous convictions are cast aside! Anyhow the public has a right to get some satisfactory explanation from both with regard to their present attitude. If Sir David is of a different opinion on the question of hoarding, may I hope, Sir, that in the interests of the enlightened public he will be so good as to state the reason why he has now come to a different conclusion from the one he stated before the Royal Currency Commission? By so doing he will render useful public service. At any rate he will have the satisfaction of exploding the current popular fallacy, stubbornly maintained, as to the existence of "vast hoards" of bullion in addition to coined silver. The public would be equally glad were Mr. O'Conor to adduce complete and convincing statistics in contradiction to the fact of the existence of the hoards in the country prior to 1854, for, Sir, he has descanted on the question in the columns of the *Pioneer* as if no India existed prior to that year or even prior to 1835. For Mr.

O'Conor's present purpose it seems that the India which was considered from the times of Pliny to the days of the Mogul to be the "abyss of silver" was absolutely non-existent!

Documents.

THE INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

THE KIMBERLEY MEMORIAL.

To His Excellency Sir Henry Brougham Loch, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's Colony of the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa.

The Memorial of the undersigned Mayor and Council of the Town of Kimberley,

Humbly showeth,

1. That your Memorialists desire to direct your Excellency's attention to the many evils and dangers resulting from having a large and steadily increasing colony of Indians, Chinamen, Kaffirs, and other natives settled in the midst of the white population.

2. That their presence is fraught with serious danger to the moral as well as physical health of the community, and that owing to their objectionable unsanitary habits and anti-European manners, the value of property in the vicinity of their dwellings is seriously depreciated.

3. That under these circumstances, in the interests of the population and community at large, it is necessary that separate locations be set aside outside the limits of the Township for the residence of all Indians, Chinamen, and Kaffirs and all other natives; and that they be compelled, under penalty, to dwell in such locations.

4. That there is no provision in the statute law of the Colony adequate to cope with such a difficulty.

5. That under Act 30 of 1884, section 2, power is given to the Borough Council

"To order, establish, alter, maintain, or "remove and make regulations for the maintenance and control of Native locations for "Indians, Immigrants, commonly called coolies, "and for the good government and control of "Natives, Coolies, and Immigrants within the "Borough."

Which is insufficient to cope with the evil complained of, as Indians and Chinamen are exempt from the operation of the law.

6. That many of these people are in the habit of herding together in unsanitary hovels and tin shanties, which are equally offensive to the sight as they are dangerous to the health of the community; and your Memorialists consider it advisable that some legislative power be conferred on the Town Council to compel the removal as well of the residents as of the squalid dens which form their dwellings.

Your Memorialists therefore humbly pray that your Excellency will be pleased to procure for your Memorialists such legislative or other relief as may be deemed necessary and desirable in the premises.

And your Memorialists, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Signed. Acting Mayor and Councillors.
Town Office, Kimberley.
May 23rd, 1893.

The Coolie Licence Committee recommend the adoption of the following memorial, and that it be sent to the Government:

The undersigned residents of Port Elizabeth desire again to call the very serious attention of the Government to the continuous and ever increasing immigration to the Colony of Indian coolies of a very low type, and of other undesirable Asiatics.

It will be in the knowledge of the Government that these immigrants, or at least the greater number of them, employ themselves almost exclusively in hawking from door to door in our principal towns and villages fruits, vegetables, and dairy produce; and as the class forms a numerous and rapidly augmenting body of non-producers, while their aggregate contributions to the general and local revenues are manifestly altogether disproportionate to the additional and special charge their presence in our midst necessitates. They add very appreciably to the already numerous number of non-producers with which the country prior to their advent was notoriously over-burdened. Their habits of life, social and domestic arrangements, predilections and surroundings, and the low standard of morality usually obtaining among them, are such as to unfit them to become a useful, much less an acceptable and desirable, addition to our population; indeed, they constitute about the most costly and objectionable accession to our already sufficiently mixed and coloured class that it could possibly receive.

For these and other cogent reasons, which must be obvious to every thinking Colonist, your Memorialists would very strongly urge upon the immediate and favourable consideration of the Government the absolute need for legislation in the following directions:

1. To restrict as far as possible and regulate the immigration of Asiatics.
2. To provide for their segregation, as also their class already in the country.
3. For subjecting these people to special direct taxation by means of a hawker's licence or otherwise.

PETITION OF THE INDIAN RESIDENTS.

To His Excellency Sir Henry Brougham Loch, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., Her Majesty's High Commissioner for South Africa.

The Memorial of the undersigned Committee, appointed by the British Indians resident in Kimberley,

Humbly showeth,

1. Your Petitioners are a committee duly appointed by the British Indians resident in Kimberley at a public meeting recently held by them in Kimberley for the purpose of considering the steps desirable to be taken for the protection of the interests of British Indians in view of possible legislative proposals hostile thereto and directed against

British Indians as a special class of Her Majesty's subjects.

2. A copy of the Resolutions passed at such meeting, and signed by the chairman thereof, is annexed for your Excellency's consideration.

3. The British Indians are natural-born subjects of Her Majesty, and as such entitled to the benefit of the laws which affect all British subjects; and they form a considerable loyal and law-abiding class of Her Majesty's subjects in Kimberley.

4. Various movements are on foot in various parts of the Colony for the purpose of securing special legislation in this Colony adverse to the British Indians as a special class of Her Majesty's subjects.

5. Your Petitioners and the British Indians generally are anxious, as in the past so in the future, to obey and respect all laws and regulations that may from time to time be in force affecting all British subjects, but are apprehensive, as aforesaid, of special legislative enactments in this Colony against them as a class depriving them or restricting them in the enjoyment of those free rights of entry into and residence in this Colony as in other parts of the British Empire which they have hitherto enjoyed in common with the rest of Her Majesty's subjects, and which they are advised and believe they are entitled to continue to enjoy.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Excellency may be pleased to take such steps as your Excellency may deem advisable to prevent such special legislation as aforesaid being passed.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Signed. { H. O. A. Ally.
Shaikh Mahomed Pooran.
D. N. Samy.

Kimberley,
June 19th, 1893.

MR. D. NAOROJI'S CONSTITUENTS AND THE FORTHCOMING INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

The Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association, in view of Mr. Naoroji's visit to India at the end of November next, have passed the following resolution:—

"1. That the General Council of the Central "Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association, "desire to record their high appreciation of the admirable and most exemplary manner in which Mr. "Dadabhai Naoroji has performed his duties as representative of this constituency in the House of "Commons; and, learning that he is, in the course "of a few months, to visit India to preside over the "Ninth Session of the Indian National Congress, "request him to communicate to that body an expression of their full sympathy, alike with all the efforts "of that Congress for the welfare of India, and with "the resolution which has been recently passed by the "House of Commons (in the adoption of which Mr. "Dadabhai Naoroji has been so largely instrumental), "in favour of holding simultaneous examinations in "India and in Britain of candidates for all the Indian "Civil Services; and further express the earnest hope "that full effect will, as speedily as possible, be given "by the Government to this measure of justice which "has been already too long delayed.

"2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded "to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

"(Signed) Joseph Walton,
"Chairman of Meeting."

The resolution has been sent to Mr. Naoroji, with an accompanying letter which says:

"Central Finsbury United Liberal and
"Radical Association,
"20, St. John Street Road,
"Clerkenwell, London, E.C.

"Dear Sir,—I have been directed to forward to "you the enclosed copy of resolution passed at the "last meeting of the Council of this Association.

"Joining in the hope of my colleagues that the "result of our efforts may be of material and lasting "good, and wishing you a fruitful journey, with a "speedy return to us, the constituents you so worthily "represent in Parliament.

"I am, yours faithfully,
"R. M. H. Griffith, Hon. Sec.

"The Hon. D. Naoroji, M.P.,
"House of Commons, Westminster.
"August 7th, 1893."

MR. CAINE AND THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

The following is a copy of the letter which Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., addressed recently to a large number of correspondents in India in view of the approaching enquiries of the Opium Commission:

"Dear Friend,

"You will doubtless be well aware, from the columns of 'Abkari,' and other sources, that the friends of temperance in Parliament have secured the appointment of two important Commissions, whose investigations will be carried on in India.

"The first was an Indian Government Commission of Enquiry, secured by myself, the object of which is to enquire into the growth, manufacture, and sale of Ganja and other hemp drugs, with a view to their prohibition. I originally asked that this enquiry should be confined to Bengal, but it has since been extended to the whole of India. Half its members consist, by my motion, of non-official natives of India, and I believe that impartial and honourable men have been selected by the Government to conduct this important enquiry.

"It will however be necessary that all our friends should be on the alert, and if the Ganja Commission should come anywhere within reasonable distance of you, I hope you or some other trusted friend may be able to attend, and offer such evidence as you may think valuable and desirable.

"The other is a Royal Commission appointed by the Queen-Empress to enquire into the Opium monopoly. This enquiry and report must inevitably have such far-reaching consequences as to make it one of the most important Royal Commissions ever constituted. The Chairman will be Lord Brassey, a man of

the widest sympathies and the most liberal principles, it will consist of eight others, of whom two will be men identified with the anti-opium agitation, one neutral Englishman, two of the official class, one medical man, and two thoroughly independent Indians. The names of the Commission are not yet fully made known, but I am able to say that Mr. Arthur Pease, Sir William Roberts, a distinguished physician, Mr. Haridas Viharidas, lately Dewan of Junagarh, a man of rare qualifications for the post, have been appointed, and that I have myself accepted a seat on the Commission. We shall all come out to India in October or thereabouts, and will spend the winter in taking evidence in different parts of the country.

"I shall be very grateful if you will call your Committee together at an early date as possible, and get from them

(1) An expression of their opinion on the various points of the enquiry.

(2) Offers of useful evidence bearing thereupon, in case the Commission should be able to visit your district.

The references to the Commission are—

(*a*) Whether the growth of the poppy, and manufacture and sale of opium in British India should be prohibited except for medicinal purposes, and whether such prohibition could be extended to Native States.

(*b*) The nature of the existing arrangements with the Native States in respect of the transit of opium through British territory, and in what terms, if any, these arrangements could be with justice terminated.

(*c*) The effect on the finances of India of the prohibition of the sale and export of opium, taking into consideration

(1) The amount of compensation payable.
(2) The cost of the necessary preventive measures.
(3) The loss of revenue.

(*d*) Whether any change short of total prohibition should be made in the system at present followed for regulating and restricting the opium traffic, and for raising a revenue therefrom.

(*e*) The consumption of opium by the different races and in the different districts of India, and the effect of such consumption on the moral and physical condition of the people.

(*f*) The disposition of the people of India in regard to

(1) The use of opium for non-medicinal purposes.
(2) Their willingness to bear in whole or in part the cost of prohibitive measures.

You will thus see that the scope of the enquiry is very wide indeed, though it falls short of completion in the absence of any power of enquiry into alternative sources of revenue, and possible economy in expenditure. It is, however, quite practicable for the Commission to report on a very wide area of enquiry, ranging from entire and immediate prohibition to gradual prohibition over a term of years, or to practical emendations of the law and restriction in administration.

You will yourself judge of what aspect of the enquiry commends itself to your special attention, and I shall esteem it a great favour if you will communicate with me as early as possible. Letters posted in India before September 15th will reach me before I leave England, and I hope to have a large number of replies from all our Branches to study on the voyage out.

I hope the Commission may visit your district, and so give me the very great pleasure of seeing you face to face.

Convey my warm regards to all my friends, and accept all good wishes for yourself.

Yours most sincerely,
W. S. CAINE.

Anglo-Indian Temperance Association.
August 10th, 1893.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

The list of petitions presented in favour of holding simultaneously in India and England open competitive examinations for the Civil Services, in accordance with the Resolution passed by the House of Commons on June 2nd, 1893, is as follows:—

July	24	From public meetings of	inhabitants of	Serampore,
Aug.	2	,,	,,	Janipur,
,,	9	,,	,,	Bhágalpur,
,,	10	,,	,,	Benares,
,,	11	,,	,,	Jalpáiguri,
,,	,,	,,	,,	Calcutta,
,,	,,	,,	,,	Poona,
,,	14	,,	,,	Ahmadnagar,
,,	16	,,	,,	Poona,
,,	22	,,	,,	Madras,
,,	,,	,,	,,	Barnagar,
,,	,,	,,	,,	Kolhápur State.

THE three greatest Indian soldiers and princes, with whom the English came into contact during the building up of their empire in India were Madhaji Sindhia, Haidar Ali, and Ranjit Singh. The first and third of these great captains have been admirably treated in the "Rulers of India" series, by Mr. H. G. Keene and Sir Lepel Griffin, and we are glad to observe that Sir W. W. Hunter has made arrangements with Mr. L. B. Bowring, C.S.I., who was Chief Commissioner of Mysore from 1862 to 1869, to contribute a volume in the same series on Haidar Ali and Tipu Sahib.

A CURIOUS mistake was made in the *Times* and most of the London daily papers, which reported that the Rájá of Nagpur was about to pay a visit to the Queen-Empress at Osborne. Of course the Rájá of Rampur was intended, and it might have been expected that even the most ignorant of sub-editors would have known that Nagpur was annexed to the British Empire in India by Lord Dalhousie.

INDIA

is published on the 1st of each month in London, and will be despatched to India by the mail preceding or succeeding the day of publication, according to circumstances.

Supplements will be published, free to subscribers, from time to time, containing VERBATIM *reports of debates on Indian questions in Parliament, and documents of historical or current interest.*

The subscription to INDIA *is 6s. a year for England and 6 rupees for India, post free.*

It is hoped that all interested in the cause of Indian Reform or in India generally will subscribe, in order that INDIA *may become self-supporting.*

INDIA *represents not only the political, but the literary and industrial revival of India, and appeals to all classes interested in the development of the country.*

All contributions, whether articles or paragraphs, will be carefully considered, and, when used, will be paid for, if payment is requested at the time of sending. Unused contributions will be returned, if a stamped and directed wrapper or envelope is enclosed, not otherwise.

Correspondence on Indian subjects generally is invited, but all letters must be authenticated by the real name and address of the writer.

It is intended to establish a special department, called 'INDIA IN ENGLAND,' *if correspondents will kindly forward information of interest regarding Indian students and other Indians resident in the United Kingdom.*

The attention of publishers and editors of magazines is called to the scheme of publishing a monthly INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY, *and their co-operation is invited.*

All communications for the EDITOR *must be addressed to the offices,* 84 *and* 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

All remittances, subscriptions, orders for copies, etc., must be addressed to the MANAGER, *at the offices,* 84 *and* 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

INDIA *presents unique advantages as an* ADVERTISING MEDIUM. *All communications as to Advertisements must be sent to the Advertisement Manager, E. Alford Wallace,* 3, *Temple Chambers, Temple Avenue, London, E.C.*

Copies of INDIA *can be procured from Mr.* ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C., and from Messrs.* DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO., *Trinity Street, Cambridge. And to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

INDIA.

LONDON, 1 SEPTEMBER, 1893.

INDIA'S NEEDS.

SIR C. DILKE ON THE RECENT MEMORANDUM.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
August 16th, 1893.

DEAR MR. NAOROJI,—

I have been reading a paper recently issued by Sir William Wedderburn and yourself and others to members of the House, and I wish to put before you the view of one who has formed his conclusions with regard to India for himself in the course of three visits to that country and some study, and who does not wholly agree with you, although he is, he fears, even more revolutionary in his views, as the changes which he would wish to see introduced are perhaps even more sweeping, on the whole, than those for which you call.

Many of the points made in the paper or incidentally referred to, which are in the nature of attack upon the existing system of Government of India, are points in which I am wholly in agreement. There can be no doubt that some saving is possible in home charges, even on the existing system. That the police in the lower ranks are often corrupt, and that the weak points of the force form a concern of the first importance to the people, are points admitted by the Government themselves. The inefficiency of the police is in a large degree a question of money, as an efficient police on anything like the present system would cost more to Indian taxes. No one can deny the hardness of the pressure of taxation in India, and especially of the Salt Tax.

When, however, we are told that Indian expenditure is excessive, in words which imply that large savings are possible, I have some hesitation in expressing concurrence. Large savings are not possible, as it seems to me, without a more considerable change of system, both civil and military, than any such Royal Commission as that which is asked for could contemplate, unless the reference to it were wider than is well-conceivable. If there were considerable excess of either military or civil expenditure, given the existing systems, over the necessities of the situation, all those who have been concerned in the government of India for many years past—successive Viceroys and Secretaries of State—would deserve any punishment that could be inflicted on them. What seems to me to be the case is rather that saving is hardly possible upon the existing system, and that there are considerable difficulties which may well prevent those responsible for the Government from suggesting changes which, nevertheless, seem to myself necessary — on grounds of cost—and likely in the long run to be made. India is, I fear, unable to afford the charge of the present system, civil and military, with the costly improvements which must be introduced into it if it is to last long. Royal Commissions are too often excuses for delay, and I fear that their reports and the evidence taken by them are seldom read. To those, however, who believe in Royal Commissions I would suggest that the case of India is a case for either a larger or a smaller Commission than that contemplated. A larger Commission would be one which would be invited to consider our whole scheme of Civil Government, and our whole plan of military enlistment. Mr. Spenser Wilkinson, writing with me on Imperial Defence, in a work published in 1892, has sketched out the details of a plan of military reorganization on which he and I agree, which would give India the present force at a lower rate, or a larger force at the same rate. Sir William Wedderburn, I believe, maintains that our military expenditure is excessive and aggressive. I am myself disposed to deny that there is aggression in our action, for example, in Chitral, or in the Black Mountain, south of the Pamirs, and on our side of the Hindu Kush. To allow the Russians to establish themselves in Chitral, as their movements of last year show that they would do if we were not there, would, I fear, mean an increase of expenditure to India. I believe that Sir William Wedderburn maintains that the United Kingdom, and not India, ought to pay for stations which he thinks are occupied in pursuance, not of Indian, but of "Imperial policy." It is difficult to admit that such stations have been occupied for any purposes except those of the defence of India upon the cheapest possible plan. If the present system is to continue (there being a universal agreement among soldiers and advisers of Governments that the field force of India against invasion must consist, as regards one-third of its numbers, of

British troops, and that a British force must remain in garrison at certain points in India, to watch cities which contain an element disaffected to the cause of order) India is not in a position to place a large force upon her frontier, and I see no practical prospect of a reduction of the Indian army, and, on the contrary, believe that there will within a few years be an increase. Moreover, the army which we are keeping up at home, with great expense to ourselves, is now defended, both from the side of our Indian military advisers and from that of a portion of our home advisers, as constituting a reserve for Indian defence; and if the present system is to continue, there is more ground for making India pay for this additional force of British troops than for making the home taxpayer pay for defensive preparations upon the Indian frontier. As regards military charge, therefore, I think that the Royal Commission asked for would in practice be more likely to lead to an increase than to a decrease of the military charges of India; and I fall back, as my hope for improvement, upon the suggestion of a revolutionary change of system.

Coming to the civil government, I cannot say that I am convinced that the authors of the paper issued by you are wise in suggesting "a general permanent "settlement" There seems much objection to the permanent settlement that exists in certain districts; and it is a question whether it would not be to the advantage of the Indian cultivator that permanent settlement should everywhere be avoided. In another proposal, namely, the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State, I fully agree, as that body (against which I wrote as long ago as 1867) will always be mainly composed of retired officials, out of touch with the Indian opinion of the day. There is also ground for thinking that the home charges can be reduced, and if the Commission asked for were not a roving Commission, but a limited Commission—to deal with such defined points as the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State and the reduction of home charges, I for one should support the proposition. There is much also to be said in favour of the abolition of those portions of the Madras and Bombay Governments which seem to be kept up for the purpose of providing patronage, at the expense of India, for British politicians. English Radicals will generally support the views of the authors of the paper in favour of the very moderate proposal of the Congress on the Arms Act; there is, too, a widespread feeling on their side that the recent action of the Government with regard to currency, however natural, given the views of the Indian Government and of the Commission, was mischievous in itself. English Radicals also, generally speaking, agree in the strictures passed by the authors of the paper on the dealings of the Indian Government with the question of the spirit duties, and several other matters of the same class.

When, however, we come to the question of large enquiry on the civil side, it seems to me, I confess, that we should cut ourselves clear from the existing system, which cannot easily or cheaply be patched or mended. Should not we have regard to the success of the experiment tried in Mysore: to the arguments put forward in a most able recent work in favour of the popularity in some parts of the Peninsula of Native Government? The authors of the paper proceed upon the lines of the present system, and ask for changes which are supposed by them to be compatible with it: for a more complete reform of the Legislative Councils, for the separation of the Judiciary and of the Executive, for the holding of Civil Service Examinations in India, for the abolition of certain unpopular taxes, though they suggest no taxation in their place. It is not easy to carry the changes suggested, and if they were carried it is very doubtful how far they would be a success. Has not the time come for raising a wider question, based on the fact, admitted by many of our most skilled civilians, that our administration does not in detail contrast favourably, as regards its popularity with the natives, with that of the best Native States under our influence, such as Mysore, some of the Rájputána States, Patiála, and some of the other Punjab States, some of the States of the Central Provinces, and (going further afield) even Nipal, though Nipal is virtually independent? These States do not, and no one would propose that those to which we should add territory or which we should gradually create, should run entirely alone. I would not let them keep up armies, and, if they should be allowed to keep them up, it is clear that we must control their military system. We must control their finance, advise them, protect them, and interfere from time to time. But some of the States constitute the best-governed parts of India. Mysore was handed back to native government in 1881. A million of the population had died of famine in the single year of 1876. Since 1881 Mysore has thriven, the population has increased, famine loans have been repaid. The limited representative institutions, which work admirably in Mysore, are well suited to the present condition of a large part of India, and there is indeed a strong case for making portions of our provinces similar to these protected Native States. In some parts of the country the hereditary principle in the chiefs and landowners would be more prominent than in others. Conversely, the representative system in some parts of the country might wisely be given locally more free play than in Mysore. But, generally speaking, under such a plan, we should look to leaving the internal government of the country, district by district, having regard to local tongues, local caste feelings, and local religions, to the care of native opinion. Except soldiering and tax-gathering, which must be retained within our care, there is little that the people of the United Kingdom would not be willing to trust to the authorised representatives of native opinion. The Government admit the immense recent improvement in the native judge and magistrate. They admit the feebleness of our police, and the existence among them of the practice of torture; and they admit that it is through the police that Government comes home to the people. While the Central Government must, of course, continue to be autocratic, under the general control of that Parliament of which we both are members, there seems to me room both for revolutionary reform in the military system, and for a continually increasing decentralisation in civil government on the plan which I have proposed. This opinion rests upon

my belief that the best Native States are more popular than we are; and in confirmation of that view I should like to end this letter by quoting some remarks of great authority from one who is the more valuable witness because a he is not in agreement with me in many other matters. In his work, "Our Indian Protectorate," published by Longmans, Mr. Tupper, of the Indian Civil Service, has a chapter on "Some Advantages of Native Rule," which is worth the most careful attention. He speaks of a government which "may elicit affection not unmingled with awe, "because it strikes the imagination of the people, "because its proceedings are generally intelligible "to them, because the high birth of the ruler has a "recognised hereditary claim on general regard, and "because there is a sympathy founded on identity "of race and religion between the ruler and his "subjects." He adds that in this sense "native "rule, when fairly well conducted, is likely to be "more popular than British administration." The author expands this opinion in a most eloquent and convincing passage, which is a complete proof of his case from the point of view of those who might be held to be prejudiced on the other side.

There are many parts of the country where our system of government is unable to give sufficient weight to the hereditary and to the aristocratic principles which survive in them for it to be popular. There are others in which our weakness is that our Government is unable to be sufficiently friendly to some established system of State religion. One of the points on which the author dwells the most is that "some principles upon which we in our position "must inevitably act are . . . . out of harmony "with native feelings and beliefs. . . . . Im- "partiality, for instance, is one of the great founda- "tions of our political strength; but it is partiality "that elicits the warmest feelings, whether of dislike "or affection." "It is difficult even for a good "native ruler to be as impartial as a British Lieu- "tenant-Governor; but the very partiality of a chief, "whether it be founded on class feeling or political "instinct or religion, is likely to endear him to "certain classes of his subjects." Illustrating his views, the author points out that when we "hold in "India that men and women, Bráhmins and sweepers ". . . . are equal before the law, are equal indeed "for any purposes whatsoever, we approach a line "on which our acts may easily become in the eyes "of the native community either positively shocking "or positively absurd. The theory of equality cuts "right across the grain of a society, where the most "familiar fact, the one thing that more than any "other affects all daily life and social intercourse, is "the separation of all men into castes and tribes." "Against the danger of enacting rules of law un- "suited to Indian societies, because they are suited "to societies more advanced, the existence of Native "States is a valuable safeguard." "Many States "have adopted some of our laws or the general "spirit of them. For purposes of Indian legislation, "I think it would be an exceedingly useful thing to "enquire which of our laws the principal Native "States have of their own motion adopted, and with "what modifications the laws adopted are enforced. "It is an advantage for the States to be able to "accept as much or as little of our most laborious "and careful legislation as they choose." "Where "Native States have voluntarily adopted methods "founded on our traditions, we may feel our position "greatly strengthened by the convergence of view. "If no unnecessary pressure be exercised, Native "States spontaneously tend to become admirable "fields for administrative experiment, to which, in "our passion for uniformity, we have, in British "territory, too little recourse."

"The Governments of Native States are thus "fortunate in possessing a local option with respect "to the laws and measures devised for British terri- "tory by the British authorities at the cost of great "labour, and after much wider experience than "any one State can command."

Such are the interesting admissions of Mr. Tupper. It is in this direction, I feel certain, that our system of civil government ought gradually to change.

Sincerely yours,
Charles W. Dilke.

AN UNMOVED MOTION.

A TALK WITH SIR W. WEDDERBURN, M.P.

On Friday, July 14th, as we stated in India for August, Sir W. Wedderburn drew first place in the ballot for motions. Accordingly he gave notice that on August 11th he would call attention to the excessive civil and military expenditure in India, and move: "That a Royal Commission be appointed to "make full enquiry and to report on the administra- "tion of India, with special reference to the military "and civil expenditure; such Commission to include "a fair proportion of representative Indians and "to take evidence in India and in England." It happened, however, that when August 11th arrived the Home Rule Bill was no longer in Committee, and consequently the Friday evening lapsed to the Government. The motion, therefore, could not be moved; but a representative of India has called upon Sir W. Wedderburn in his little den over the office of India at Palace Chambers, Westminster, and the following is a report of their conversation on the subject of the motion:

"I am sorry that you were deprived of your opportunity on the 11th of drawing attention to the excessive military and civil expenditure in India, and moving for a Royal Commission."

"Yes, we could not help that. But I cannot complain of having been intentionally robbed of my day, because the original resolution of the House gave Friday evenings to the Government, except while the Home Rule Bill was in Committee. By Friday, the 11th, the Bill had reached the report stage, and the Speaker was in the Chair; so that under the resolution the evening of that day lapsed to the Government without any fresh action on their part. We had our 'Whip' ready printed to send to all members sympathetic with India, and were just in time to stop its issue when we found that our chance was gone. It was no doubt a disappointment, but we must hope for better luck next time."

"Will you indicate to me the line you proposed to follow?"

"I did not propose to trouble the House with many figures, nor to make a long speech. I wished to show the great increase of expenditure by a comparison, in round numbers, of the present figures with those of ten years ago. And my proposition is that this vast and growing expenditure is ruinous to the people of India; while it does no good to us, but harm, being incurred in pursuance of an aggressive military policy, which must in the end bring disaster on our rule. Taking the question of figures, and reckoning in tens of rupees, I find that in 1883-4 the total Indian expenditure (omitting railways and irrigation) amounted to 56 millions, which may roughly be divided into: military charges, 18 millions; Civil Government, 15½ millions; and other charges (including collection of revenue, roads, Post Office, interest on debt, etc.), 22½ millions. But when we come to the estimate for 1893-4 we find that the total expenditure has risen from 56 to 68 millions; the military charges amounting to 23½ millions, Civil Government to 20 millions, and other expenses to 24½ millions. That is, on an average, more than a million has been added each year to the expenditure, although it has long been admitted that the utmost limit of reasonable taxation has been reached. How does this compare with the rate of increase for the same period in this country? In the United Kingdom for 1882 the military expenditure was 15¾ millions, and the civil expenditure 18 millions, making a total of 33¾ millions. And in 1892 the figures were: military charges, 17¼ millions; civil charges, 19 millions, or a total of 36¼ millions. In the United Kingdom, therefore, the richest country in the world, the increase in ten years has been only 2½ millions, or about 7½ per cent.; whereas in India, the poorest country in the world, the increase (from 33½ to 43½ millions) in civil and military expenditure has been ten millions, or about 30 per cent. In other words, the increase of expenditure in India has been at a rate four times greater than that in England. You ask how this difference can be accounted for? It is accounted for by the simple fact that in the one case men are spending other people's money, and in the other case they are spending their own. You know how difficult it is for the advocates of economy in the House of Commons to prevent waste, jobbery, and extravagance in the great spending departments at home, although here the taxpayer is the master and these departments are his servants. But what must we expect in India, where the position is reversed, and where the great spending departments are the absolute masters; where the taxpayer has no voice at all in the expenditure; where his only function is to pay the taxes demanded from him? I believe that the Indian Civil Service is as honest and hard-working a service as the world has ever seen. But it is demanding too much from poor human nature to expect that any class of men will systematically prefer the interests of the public to their own; and that they will readily initiate economies in the administration which mean the reduction of their own salaries and the abolition of their own appointments. Under such a system the wonder rather is that things are no worse. And the Indian administrator may well, like Clive, stand amazed at his own moderation."

"You say that the present military policy will bring disaster on our rule? How is that?"

"Because it is based upon a wrong principle: distrust of the people. The real defence of India is to conciliate the affection of the people of India, and this is no difficult thing to do, for they expect little, and they are a gentle, intelligent, and grateful race. With them a little kindness goes a long way. Through its military extravagance the Indian Government is driven to impose objectionable taxes, and also to collect these taxes with extreme rigour through ill-paid subordinates, which produces widespread discontent; while on the other hand they are without funds for the most crying needs of the people, such as the reform of the police, the separation of executive and judicial functions, and the promotion of health and education. An effective redress of such grievances is the true means of fortifying our position in India. It is easy in political matters to over-estimate the value of military force, if it stands alone. I remember an old Scottish rhyme which says:

> 'Three gallant knights set Scotland free,
> Sir Moss, Sir Moor, Sir Mountain;
> And to these add yet other three,
> Hunger, Cauld,—and Dunton.'

'Dunten' means hard knocks. Similarly for the defence of India, military force is not the first requisite. I often differ from the views expressed by my friend, Sir Lepel Griffin. But on this point he is very sound. In his article, 'Is India Safe?', in the July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, he places in their right order the considerations on which the safety of India depends. First he places the disposition of the mass of the Indian people; next that of the Indian princes; then the attitude of Afghánistán and her rulers; and last of all he ranks military and strategic measures of defence. And this view has the practical confirmation of all Russian military authorities, who in their schemes for invading India look for success to a general native rising behind the thin red line of British troops which will face the invaders along the frontier. Now I say that our present costly and aggressive military policy damages us equally with our own people in India and with our neighbours round the frontier. Our constant encroachments make us a standing menace and a terror to every State and tribe which desires to maintain its independence. The Government of India, when it fixes its eyes on one of its smaller neighbours beyond the frontier, always reminds me of the boa constrictor at the Zoological Gardens looking at a rabbit. The end is the same, whether the victim, paralysed by fear, allows itself to be quietly absorbed, or makes a wild and futile resistance speedily crushed by irresistible force. And what must be the feeling of the other rabbits who are spectators while this process is going on? The iniquity of such a policy is only equalled by its folly. For every time that we advance our frontier by annexing a fresh tract of wild and mountainous country we weaken our position, bringing ourselves

into unnecessary collision with new and still more intractable tribes. Have you ever seen a prickly pear hedge? Prickly pear is a sort of cactus covered with minute barbed thorns which remain embedded in the flesh of anyone who touches it. Now if I have a garden with a prickly pear hedge round it, I think it would be folly to force myself into that hedge and sit there to await attack. Better leave it intact with all its prickles for the benefit of the invader. But this does not suit the ambitions of those who direct our frontier policy. As long as we leave our Indian affairs in the hands of a chauvinist clique at Simla, who get promotion, honours, and emoluments from these aggressions, we must be content to accept the responsibility and the fruits of such follies."

"But these contentions are, of course, disputed by the officials?"

"They are. And it is precisely for that reason that we demand independent enquiry by experts—by men, that is to say, who are not interested in enforcing a particular view, and are not committed to one."

"And you think that this end will be best attained by the appointment of a Royal Commission."

"Yes, I am strongly of that opinion. We might, of course, have asked for a Select Committee, and I do not deny that, as a means of enquiry, a Select Committee has its advantages. But in the present case a Royal Commission is better, and that for at least three reasons. In the first place it does not disappear with the prorogation of Parliament. Again, members of the House of Commons have their hands pretty full just now with other work. And, in the third place, we can have on a Royal Commission experienced non-official Indians who are unwilling to leave India. The Commission also can go out to India and take evidence on the spot."

"You will, therefore, seize another opportunity for moving your resolution."

"Yes I shall, but not, I think, immediately. I might have ballotted at once for another day, but I refrained from doing so because it is probable that up to the recess the House of Commons will not be very fully attended, and it will be tired, as well as small. We have, therefore, deferred our case for the present until the Indian Budget comes up for discussion."

"And when do you expect that that will be?"

"Well, we have put in a request that it may not be brought on before the recess. We look to a good opportunity in the autumn sittings, and the terms of Mr. Gladstone's recent letter seem to justify us in believing that we shall not be disappointed."

THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA.

By A. O. Hume, C.B.

In view of Mr. A. O. Hume's forthcoming visit to India it seems worth while to reproduce the following interesting account of Indian needs which he gave some time ago to an interviewer—shortly, in fact, before the accession of the Liberal Government to office. Mr. Hume said:

The position in India is exactly this. While some small sections of the community are growing wealthier and are far better off than they ever were or ever could have been under any Indian administration, a huge section of the community—probably nearly half the population—is, in consequence of misgovernment in various directions, growing poorer and poorer day by day, and a number, variously estimated at from forty to sixty millions, are living permanently on the verge of starvation. They have no resources to fall back upon in time of pressure, and the consequence is that, whenever that pressure comes, they die by millions. The British Government itself admits that in twelve years fully eighteen million persons died of starvation. But this number altogether understates the real gravity of the position, because to those who died actually of starvation, we have to add many more millions of persons who, in consequence of an enfeebled physique due to the suffering they underwent and temporarily survived when their weaker brethren succumbed, were afterwards carried off by premature death. Now, quite independently of the sufferings of the Indian people and of my sympathy with and love for those among whom I have lived for more than forty years, and from whom I have received unnumbered marks of confidence and affection, I consider that the existing situation in India is one that distinctly imperils the integrity of the whole British Empire. It is the feeling of hopelessness of getting anything done in the right direction for India by any ordinary measures and appeals that has determined me to speak out in the clearest manner possible as regards the extreme instability at the present moment of British rule in India, and the certainty of its speedy overthrow unless at once we broaden its base by associating with it the intelligence, the energy, and the local knowledge of the people themselves. This opinion has, of course, provoked a violent outcry among the so-called "common-sense" or, as I should call them, "common-place" people—the people who don't like to be warned in regard to unpleasant contingencies—the political cowards who, if they are to be shot, wish to have a handkerchief tied before their eyes. The whole world teems with men who are ever unwilling to face bravely and take due account of the consequences of their deeds and omissions. But no outcry and no protestation can in any way alter the facts of this case—that a large section of the Indian people are starving, that a still larger section are approaching day by day the verge of starvation, and that the widespread misery and the poverty and the suffering which are the result are accompanied by an equally widespread, silent, sullen discontent. It will be for the people of England—the electors as a body—to decide whether it is better to realise the actual state of affairs, or to have it hidden from them by rose-coloured official veils until these are rent by the actual outbreak of the tempest.

I have at the outset referred to misgovernment. It is absolutely useless to consult on this subject gentlemen, however long they may have lived in India, who left the country eight or ten years ago. The last ten years have seen such a change in the

thoughts of the people as is, I believe, unexampled in the history of nations. Of the meaning of this change I will give you only a single instance, but one which, if it be carefully considered, will be found to involve really the whole position. Ten or twelve years ago, if there occurred a famine, a bad harvest, an outbreak of cholera, or any other calamity, the people as a body, contentedly set it down as the act of God, fate, or providence. To-day, whatever misfortune befalls them, and whether the Government is or is not really to blame—and it usually is—every calamity is attributed to the British Government. It is not, of course, without some cause that there has been this change of opinion, and, although many causes have combined to bring it about, I really believe that the main one has been the adoption by the Tory party of that fatal Imperialist policy which is at the root of all the present sufferings of the Indian people. You can understand the question very briefly. Commencing with the absolutely unprincipled and indefensible invasion of Afghanistan by Lord Lytton under the Marquis of Salisbury's instructions, the administration of India has, with the exception of the peaceful interlude of good Lord Ripon's viceroyalty, been, under Tory auspices, merely a succession of criminal attacks upon, and plunder of, all India's weaker neighbours. Coupled with this policy, there has been an increase of military expenditure from something like fourteen to somewhat over twenty Indian conventional millions —I mean Rx. millions—and, as we think, under pretence of defending India these Imperialists have created practically outside the control of Parliament a gigantic army intended not so much to defend India as to extend and consolidate British power outside the limits of India and to strengthen Great Britain in any European campaign by an array of forces which the Houses of Parliament would never have permitted at the expense of the British taxpayer. During a comparatively short period since this Imperialist policy was initiated by Lord Salisbury somewhat over fifty millions in extra expenditure have been thrown upon India. Of this some twenty-two millions are due to extra annual expenditure, and the remainder to fortifications, frontier defences, strategic railways, punitive expeditions beyond our frontiers, and the like. And those fifty millions have been extracted from what is, even by officials, admitted to be the poorest people on the face of the earth. As a consequence of the necessity of finding money for this criminal extravagance, the salt tax has been raised, the income tax—a tax wholly unsuited to the country and the people—has been imposed, the excise has been forced up to the highest possible limit—although in regard to this, the stand made by Mr. Caine, Mr. Samuel Smith and others, has somewhat changed the position—the forest laws which were passed originally under the most solemn declaration that they were intended not to swell the revenue but merely to protect the national property for posterity have been almost vindictively worked so as to swell the revenue, and lastly, the land revenue system, under which years and years ago we were solemnly promised permanent settlements, has been utilised in a totally opposite sense. Settlements have been shortened instead of being rendered permanent, so that the settlements which are being carried out at the present moment in the Central Provinces are being made for ten, eleven, and twelve years only, instead of for the thirty years which, even under the temporary system of settlement, was considered to be the minimum period.

It is not only the gross extravagance on military material and preparations that is pauperising the people, although this is the most potent of the evil influences at work. Our civil administration is probably the most extravagant in the whole world, and that solely because we insist upon employing in nine-tenths of all the positions of trust and importance in the country imported Englishmen, to whom naturally—hating the climate and the country and the people as the majority of them do—it is necessary to give very large salaries, if at all able and competent men are to be secured. As a fact, among the educated Indians really more competent men could be secured for most of these offices at salaries ranging from one-third to one-half of what the European officials now draw. But the Government will have none of them. All privileged bureaucracies are necessarily Tory. Let us give them credit for the best possible intentions, but they are aliens and foreigners—absolutely unable to realise the geniut of the people—and the consequence is that the greas majority of their most philanthropic efforts on behalf of the people lead, in consequence of their ignorance, to confusion worse confounded. There is, you see, no doubt that they want the best possible government of the people and for the people. But it must not be by the people. It must be by themselves, in whose superior wisdom they have unbounded faith. Moreover, the very foundation of their whole policy is not "Trust the people," but "Distrust the people." The consequence is that the Indians, who really do know what the people are suffering, who really do know what remedies should and can be applied, and who really are qualified to make the best of a bad job, have no part whatsoever in the administration, and have no chance whatsoever of so distributing the burdens on their shoulders as to make them gall as little as possible. You have, as I have already explained, a wicked military extravagance. You have extravagance in the civil department. But all this would not be so bad—so absolutely pernicious in its effects—if the people themselves were allowed to decide how the moneys required for this culpable extravagance could be raised with the least suffering to the people.

But I am afraid that I am already exhausting your patience, and I must turn at once to the remedies which are essential. The first thing is to associate the people largely in the administration. At least one-half of the more important offices held by Europeans should be, within the next three or four years, transferred to Indians, and, as time goes on, the proportion of Indians should be increased. The people should be represented on the councils, and represented by their own elected members. It will for many years to come be sufficient if one-half of the members of each of the councils be thus elected. There is not the slightest difficulty in getting men thus elected. Year by year not only without any assistance from the Govern-

ment, but in the teeth of the secret opposition of the whole official body, representatives are elected by many millions of electors to the Indian National Congress, and were the Government only to adopt the system, lay down a definite franchise, and avail itself of the existing machinery, it could in one year secure the required number of first-class men on all its councils, elected by the entire intelligence of the nation. To these councils larger powers must, of course, be given than they enjoy at present. But I need not dwell upon these, because the Tory party themselves, unwilling though they are to improve the constitution of the councils, agree that the existing councils, which are nominated (not elected) must if they are to be of any use, enjoy such further powers. The next great point is the reduction of the military expenditure in India. The British forces must be reduced by at least 20,000 men, and the native forces reduced by an equal number. The force that will thus remain will amply suffice to defend India, if it is supplemented by the efforts of the people of the country. As a matter of fact, if you will only deal justly with the people of India, so that they may rally round you in any future trouble as they did in the time of the Indian Mutiny, British rule will be more secure, and the whole empire safer with only half the number of troops you now have than it will be, in the present state of public feeling, even if you double the existing armaments. Consequent on these great reductions in civil and military expenditure there might be a reduction in the salt tax (which is our only financial reserve, and which in times of peace should be kept at the lowest possible level) to one rupee per maund, against the two rupees, eight annas, that are now levied. You could insist on the excise being administered solely for the purpose of repressing intemperance, and devote all revenue arising therefrom to educational purposes, without—and this is essential—allowing any of the existing grants for education to be reduced. Then England can also afford to fulfil her promises as regards the permanent settlements and so enable capital and labour to improve to its fullest extent the agriculture of India, on which ninety per cent. of the population depends for subsistence. Under the existing system of temporary settlements, no man will put either his capital or the best of his labour into the land, when he knows that in a very few years—at the revision of the settlement—the Government will step in and appropriate all the fruits of both.

These are the leading remedial measures. There are hundreds of smaller ones, but these will all be satisfactorily disposed of as soon as the people themselves are effectively represented on the Councils. I am sorry that I have not the time to go into further details now, but I want to repeat what I began by saying—namely, that although no mortal man can predict the exact when or how of such an occurrence, unless the British public are prepared through its representatives to afford relief to the people of India and see something like justice done to them, a few short years—it may be a little sooner, it may be a little later—will see the termination of that unparalleled episode in human history, the British empire in the East.

Reviews.

CAMPBELL'S MEMOIRS.

Memoirs of my Indian Career. By Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, M.P., K.C.S.I., D.C.L. Edited by Sir Charles E. Bernard, K.C.S.I. 2 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co. Price 21s.)

[FIRST NOTICE.]

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL is too generally regarded in England as the typical Indian administrator, who failed in the House of Commons. In India he is more justly remembered as one of the most liberal minded reformers, who ever ruled an Indian province. As time goes on his reputation will approximate to the latter standard, and his lack of success as a Parliamentary orator will be forgotten, while his Indian career will receive more full appreciation. The value of these *Memoirs* lies partly in the vivid illustrations afforded of the vigour and orginality of mind of the author, and Sir Charles Bernard has done good service in preparing them for the press and not allowing them to be cast aside because they are incomplete and not finally revised. All who are acquainted with Sir George Campbell's writings, whether official or non-official—and who that studies Indian questions is unacquainted with them?—are aware that he possessed a peculiar independence of thought, which no occupation of official posts could trammel, and that he always insisted upon looking into things with his own eyes instead of relying on traditional usage or taking the opinions of others. These qualities caused him to leave his mark wherever he served in India, and shine out in his *Memoirs*. They were characteristic of the man, and it is a matter for general congratulation that in the later years of his life he made time to place on paper his ripest thoughts on Indian questions for the instruction and enlightenment of a future generation.

The importance of this book is so great that I purpose in INDIA to devote two articles to it, the first dealing with Campbell's career in India as a whole and his reflections upon general questions, and the second with his noteworthy administration in Bengal. The somewhat discursive fashion in which it is compiled lends itself freely to quotation. There is hardly a burning question of Indian politics on which he has not written acute and luminous pages, full of statesmanlike insight and sound common sense, and his opinion is always worthy of consideration. In the next number I propose to reproduce his remarks on the Assam tea garden coolie legislation, which I have already dwelt upon in former issues, and I venture to add his testimony to what has already been said upon this subject.

In this review I do not propose to give a sketch of Sir George Campbell's life, but rather to notice his matured opinion, as given in these *Memoirs*, on Indian questions. The autobiographical side of the volumes has been already extensively noticed in both the English and the Indian press, and though his account of his life is full of interest, it is with Sir George Campbell's opinions rather than with his life that I am chiefly concerned. It is necessary only to

summarise his career in order to show how fully qualified he was to form an opinion on Indian questions. Born in 1824, he was educated at the Edinburgh Academy, at Madras College, St. Andrews, at the University of St. Andrews, and at Haileybury. He proceeded to India in 1842 and served in the North-Western Provinces at Budaun, Moradábád, and in the Cis-Sutlej States up to the time of taking his first furlough in 1851. On his return to work he was posted to Azamgarh, then served as Commissioner of Customs, and as acting Commissioner of the Cis-Sutlej States, and he was on leave in the hills prior to taking up office as Secretary to the Government of the North-Western Provinces when the Mutiny broke out. The Mutiny changed the course of his career. He was the first man to enter Delhi after its capture, accompanied Hope Grant's force from Agra to Cawnpur, became personal assistant to Lord Canning to write the weekly account of the progress of the suppression of the Mutiny for the India Office, and was eventually appointed Judicial and Financial Commissioner for Oudh in 1858. This post he resigned in 1860, and went again on furlough. From 1862 to 1866 he was a Judge of the Calcutta High Court, in 1866-67 President of the Orissa Famine Commission, and in 1867-68 Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces. After a further furlough from 1868 to 1870, he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and held that office from 1871 to 1874.

The first burning question on which Sir George Campbell has some pertinent remarks is on the training of Indian civilians. Like all old Haileybury men he has a good word to say for the class of men trained in the famous Hertfordshire college. In his own words: "The young men, caught young and "taught to believe themselves especially fortunate, "took a pride in the service; they had a wonderfully "effective training in India, and almost all became "zealous. I think they took more to the natives "than more mature men, and they more readily "accepted the view that they were given body and "soul to the Government—must look to no other "emoluments whatever, and scrupulously abstain "from all other enterprises. I say all this, not "denying that the present mode of selection is "better, but as showing that there was something "to be said on the other side too, and to explain "why, in my opinion, the difference in efficiency "between the old and the new service is not so very "wide as might be supposed, considering the difference in the manner of selection. . . . . Haileybury "was generally popular. It was in a good situation; "the life was not unpleasant, the East India Company provided the best of professors, the education "was on the whole much better than we should "have got elsewhere, and we made many friendships. "Possibly it was too exclusive; and it may be that "young men who are now specially cared for at "Balliol are better placed, though I am not sure of "it; and when young men are scattered at various "places of education I doubt it altogether. Of this "I feel sure, that an independent student life in "London is bad for Europeans, and worse for "natives of India" (vol. i., pp. 8, 9). There is much in these few lines that deserves serious consideration. It is now generally acknowledged that the abolition of Haileybury was a mistake, and that the old *ésprit de corps* which distinguished the Haileybury civilians does not flourish as fully among their successors.

The first independent command held by Sir George Campbell was in the Cis-Sutlej territory, and the most valuable part of the first volume of his *Memoirs* is his description of this portion of his career. There does not exist in the English language any account of the Cis-Sutlej territory at the time of the first Sikh war so clear and so instructive as his, and his remarks upon the Sikhs and the nature of their confederacy cause a natural regret that the author did not attempt a historical work upon the subject. His digression upon the causes of the outbreak of the first Sikh war is made more interesting by the fact of its being to some extent a criticism of the biography of Major George Broadfoot by his brother. No one doubts, any more than Sir George Campbell, the "ability and energy" of Broadfoot, and the question as to the wisdom or unwisdom of his proceedings with regard to the Sikh Khalsa had been buried when the biography on which Campbell animadverts was published. It is satisfactory to find that Campbell distinctly bears out the view of that badly treated historian, Major Joseph Cunningham, that the Sikhs honestly believed they were the injured party in the transactions which led to the first war, and that they were not the aggressors the official representation made them out to be. This is the view held by all students of the war itself, not blinded by officialism, and it is most gratifying to find one so well acquainted with the facts by his position at the time supporting it. Incidentally it may be noted that in this part of his work he sets forward the view that the ancient historic river the Saraswati is the Jumna, which he argues in ancient times flowed westwards to the Indus, instead of eastwards to the Ganges. The second Sikh War, however, Campbell believed to be inevitable. "I "had always prophesied," he says, "that the arrangement of 1848 would not succeed. The native "Government, leaders and army were maintained, "but they were wholly over-ridden by a set of young "politicals, who magnified their exploits in their "communications to the press, but irritated and "alienated the Sikhs. The second war was bound "to come, and the result was a much more satisfactory settlement" (vol. i., p. 90).

Sir George Campbell's chapter on the Mutiny is eminently sober. Contemporaries report him to have been one of the men who did not lose their heads during that great crisis, and his coolness appears in his remarks on the subject as well as in his conduct at the time. He is rather severe upon the accredited historians of the Mutiny, Sir John Kaye and Colonel Malleson. Of Sir John Kaye he says: "He was "not in India at the time, and his history is a "compilation; but in that view I am bound to say "that so far as regards the facts he seems to have "conscientiously brought them together to the best "of his lights. So far his only fault seems to be "the usual fault of professional historians, that he "even paints his colours, makes his heroes too heroic, "his panics and his atrocities possibly somewhat "over-sensational. And as regards his political

"views I do not think him at all reliable. He does "not deduce his opinions from facts, but seeks to "make his facts to fit his opinions. I should like "entirely to cut off the first volume, in which he "constructs out of his inner consciousness an elaborate "political foundation for the Mutiny. On the other "hand, Colonel Malleson, whose facts I think much "less reliable, professing to write a continuation of "Kaye's history, thinks it necessary to re-write, as "he says, the third volume; but in reality he re-"writes both the second and third, mainly, it ap-"pears, for the purpose of contradicting Kaye and "reversing his judgments—setting up as heroes "those whom Kaye has condemned, and pulling "down those whom Kaye has praised" (vol. i., pp. 210, 211). In Campbell's opinion the Mutiny was purely the military mutiny of the Hindustani soldiers. He utterly denies that it was accompanied by a popular rising, and gives chapter and verse for his position by showing that while the struggle was in progress, the people throughout the North-West Provinces, which he traversed after the capture of Delhi, were at work as usual, undisturbed by the military operations. His account of his own experiences is picturesque enough, but its value rests in its testimony to the generally peaceful attitude of the people as opposed to the soldiery. In the problems of reconstruction he was naturally more interested than in the military details of the Sepoy War, and his analysis of the political reaction in Oude, which was typified in the *talukdari* settlement in that province, is pregnant with sound reflection and careful conclusions. His final words on the results of the Mutiny show that he, at least, was not so convinced of the manifold superiority of the India of the Queen over the India of the Company as many of his contemporaries. "I fear," he says, "that "the events of the Mutiny long left their mark in a "certain alienation of feeling between Her Majesty's "European subjects in India and the natives. Many "changes resulted, some for better, some for worse, "and I am not sure which preponderate. I doubt "very much whether the changes are all so greatly "for the better as many people think" (vol. i., pp. 304, 305).

I have only space to quote a couple of passages in which Sir George Campbell states his opinion on the Indian military police, and the forward frontier policy, both questions now to the front. They are illustrations of what I meant when I said that there was hardly a question of Indian administration, on which he has not given an original and independent criticism, which deserves careful consideration. "For "real civil police work" he says, "military equip-"ment, and the military spirit is nothing but a "hindrance and an encumbrance. A policeman's "work is entirely different from a soldier's; military "stiffness and honour stand very much in the way "of coping with thieves on their own ground—a "good soldier often makes an extremely bad police-"man. Ordinarily in India there is not the smallest "need of a quasi-military force to keep down the "population as there is in Ireland. However, after "the Mutiny, new police forces were established all "over India under European officers, some more, "some less military, and it was supposed we were to "come to a kind of millennium in regard to crime. "Then it was said we must make the police indepen-"dent of those charged with judicial functions, upon "the clap-trap maxim that the same man must not "be thief-taker and judge, which is not really "carried out in full in any country, not even in "England. It was sought to make the superinten-"dent of police as independent of the magistrate of "the district as the Commander-in-Chief is of the "Civil Governor, in regard to military affairs, and "there was danger of the real control of the district "drifting away from the experienced magistrate to "a police officer who might or might not be qualified "for such a task" (vol. i, pp. 156, 157).

On the question of frontier policy, Sir George Campbell agreed with Lord Lawrence on the inexpediency of passing the Indus. He ardently supported the annexation of the Punjab, and acknowledging this, he says: "But my side of the case is, "that from the very first I avowed the desire to "reach the natural limits of India, and to stop "there. Forty or more years ago I was as much "opposed to going beyond the Indus into Afghan "districts (and, I may add, to going beyond the "Bay of Bengal to Burma) as I have been to "occupying Egypt and some other parts of Africa. "I still very much believe that the view I always "held about the Indus boundary was right, and that "it would have been very much better in many ways "if we had abstained from annexing the Trans-"Indus districts inhabited by an Afghan population. "Not only are they unprofitable in themselves, but "they put the ruler of Kabul in an altogether false "position—deprived as he is of the really Afghan "valleys of Eastern Afghanistan, while he holds a "great deal of non-Afghan territory on the west "entirely exposed to the Russian power, and practi-"cally at their mercy. He is not in real contact "with us, owes no territory to us, and holds nothing "of which we can easily deprive him in case of "need" (vol. i, pp. 96, 97). On this subject Campbell defends John Lawrence's proposition to surrender Peshawar to Dost Muhammad during the Mutiny, saying that: "It seems nothing could be "more reasonable and prudent under the circum-"stances than to think of abandoning our un-Indian "possession, of at best very doubtful advantage to "us, in order to secure Delhi and India. In the "Mutiny the man who deserved most credit was he "who was willing to spare troops to help where they "were most needed, not he who insisted on keeping "them in his own district as Edwardes did. And "the attempt to give Edwardes credit in this matter "at the expense of Lawrence seems to me much out "of place. Even Lord Canning's admirers are "scarcely justified for the credit they claim, because, "after keeping Lawrence in suspense for six weeks, "at the end of that time the telegram was sent, "'Hold on to the last.' Circumstances had then a "good deal changed, but I still think that, even in "August, the Peshawar force might with great "advantage have been sent to Delhi to assist in the "assault in September" (vol. i, pp. 237).

It must not be thought that because I have laid weight on Campbell's views on questions of Indian administration, his "Memoirs" have not also a

considerable value in their description of India at different periods, of the current of Indian opinion, and above all in their characterization of the various officials with whom he was brought into contact. His notices of the Governor-Generals and Viceroys whom he knew, Ellenborough, Hardinge, Dalhousie, Canning, Mayo, and Northbrook, are vivid pictures, not the less interesting because they do not always tally with the commonly received accounts, and even more luminous are his occasional remarks on famous Anglo-Indians, like Thomason, Colvin, Broadfoot, the Lawrences, Sir Henry Ramsay, Edwardes, Sir Archdale Wilson, Hodson, Nicholson, and Colin Campbell.

A GREAT LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

James Thomason and the British Settlement of North-Western India. By Sir RICHARD TEMPLE, Bart, M.P., G.C.S.I., D.C.L., LL.D. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1893. Price 3s. 6d.)

IT was with sincere pleasure that all students of the history of the English in India learned that Sir William Hunter had persuaded Sir Richard Temple to write a short biography of James Thomason for the "Rulers of India" series. The volume has now appeared, not as one of the series but as a supplementary volume of the same size, printed in the same excellent fashion, and bound after the same pattern. It really does not matter whether it technically belongs to the series or not; its readers will all the same be grateful both to Sir William Hunter and Sir Richard Temple for its production.

The only sketch of Thomason's life with which I was acquainted before the publication of the volume under review is contained in an admirable little volume entitled "Anglo-Indian Worthies" by Henry Morris, late of Madras Civil Service, which was published at Madras in 1890. Sir Richard Temple does not seem to have been acquainted with this excellent little biographical sketch, and he fails to give us a portrait of Mr. Thomason as Mr. Morris has done. Had he been acquainted with the earlier volume he might have extracted one or two of the excellent anecdotes given by Mr. Morris. As it is Sir Richard seems to have worked mainly from manuscript material supplied by Thomason's relatives, and he has drawn largely on his personal recollections of his hero.

Most of the men whose lives are painted in the "Rulers of India" series made or at least built up their reputations in periods of war. The only Indian civilians whose biographies have yet appeared, Warren Hastings, Mountstuart Elphinstone, and John Lawrence all played a much more dramatic part upon the scene of Indian history than did the most famous ruler of the North-Western Provinces. They held authority when the British Empire in India was growing, and at times of great crises, and though no series of biographies bearing on Indian history could be considered complete if they were omitted, yet their careers were in no way typical of the lives led by some of the greatest of the English civilians who have served in India. Thomason was perhaps greatest of all the peace rulers who have held sway in India since the English established their power. It has been said that there is no branch of administration in the North-West Provinces which does not bear the trace of his hand. Education, public works, land-administration, every branch of the manifold responsibilities which the English have undertaken in India bears the impress of his sagacious intellect. But it was not only in what he did that he has left his mark, for he formed a great school of civilians who are proud to acknowledge themselves his pupils, and who learned from him that higher than the duty they owed to the East India Company was the duty they owed to the people of the country among whom their lot was cast. A life spent in peaceful pursuits like that of Thomason does not lend itself to dramatic treatment, and can hardly be made into a fascinating biography. But it is impossible to avoid observing that Sir Richard Temple might have found more space for describing his hero's administrative reforms, such, for instance, as his education policy, the account of which is very meagre, if he had avoided dwelling at such length upon Thomason's religious views. His spiritual history does not differ much from that of other men, and I confess that I for one get a little tired of his extracts from pious books. A very interesting essay might be written upon the prevalence of the Clapham School of Evangelicals in the civil and military services of the East India Company. The low church fervour which possessed the hearts and minds of the great Punjab Commission is one of their most curious characteristics. But Sir Richard Temple does not so much trace the effect of Thomason's convictions on his subordinates or his method of government as in their influence upon his own mind. This is the only criticism which I have to make upon the volume, for in every other respect it is a worthy supplement to the "Rulers of India" series.

Of Thomason's early work as District and Settlement Officer at Azamgarh, and as Foreign Secretary to Lord Ellenborough, there is little need to speak, the importance of his career belongs to the ten years from 1843 to 1853, during which he held the post of Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces. The Presidency of Agra, which was created on the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1833, only lasted for eighteen months, and was replaced in 1836 by the Lieutenant-Governorship of the North-Western Provinces. In this office Thomason had only three predecessors, Sir Charles Metcalfe, Mr. J. C. Robertson, and Sir George Russell Clerk, none of whom held office for more than two years. Thomason had therefore practically the task of moulding the character of the administration of the most important Government in Upper India. How excellently he did his work is to be seen in the amused contempt with which officials trained under him looked down upon what they were pleased to consider the slipshod Governments of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay. He trained his men so thoroughly that it was from them that the famous Punjab Commission was largely recruited. In their methods, in their love for the people, and in their efficiency, the North-West civilians were acknowledged second to none in India, and this character was imprinted upon them both by the teaching and the example of James Thomason.

Though Sir Richard Temple has many valuable pages on the effect of Thomason's administration, he only amplifies the following sentences of Sir J. W. Kaye, which were published in the last year of Thomason's government. They are quoted by Mr. Henry Morris ("Anglo-Indian Worthies," p. 76). "There is a freshness, a vigour, a healthy, robust "youth, apparent everywhere in the administration "of these provinces. I do not believe that there is "in the world a more conscientious and more labour-"ious class of civil functionaries than those who, "under one of the best men and ablest administrators "who have ever devoted their lives to the service of "the people of India, are now bearing the burden "and heat of the day in serious toilsome efforts to "make the yoke of foreign conquest sit lightly on "the native subjects of the British Crown. What "Thomason and his associates have done for Upper "India can only be fairly appreciated by those who "know what was the state of these Provinces fifty, "or even twenty years ago."

INDIAN POLITICAL LAW.

Our Indian Protectorate: An introduction to the study of the relations between the British Government and its Indian feudatories. By Charles Lewis Tupper, Indian Civil Service. (London: Longmans and Co. Price 16s.)

It is an encouraging sign of the times that Indian officers are now doing good work in endeavouring to define the position and attitude of the Indian Government. Quite a library could be formed of the books written at different epochs on the nature and the basis of the British rule in India. Most of the earlier writers on this subject had been misled by European analogies, and have arrived at somewhat various conclusions. Even powerful thinkers like Sir John Malcolm and Mountstuart Elphinstone were occasionally led into error in their conclusions in spite of their extraordinary grasp of Indian questions. The late Sir George Campbell's "Modern India," which was published in 1853, marked a new era in the theoretical discussion of the British position in India. But even Campbell failed to grasp some of the essential principles of the subject he set himself to treat, for with all his knowledge and experience he shared with his contemporaries the haziness of political conception which was characteristic of political thought in England before the days of Sir Henry Maine. Since the writings of that great English political philosopher have cleared the way a new generation has arisen which is able alike to think more clearly and to express itself more clearly upon questions of government and administration. Mr. Tupper, in his opening chapters, bears ungrudging testimony to his obligations to Sir Henry Maine, and it is among the chief merits of his book that he has a clear grasp of Maine's conclusions, and is not led away into vague verbiage about the blessings of British rule.

The question which Mr. Tupper has set himself to examine is the nature of the relations which exist between the British Government in India and the protected or feudatory States. Mr. Tupper is a distinguished civilian who has held many high posts in the Punjab and in the Government of India, and he writes from personal experience in the work of administration. But he is careful to state in his preface that he writes as a private individual, and not as an official, and that his conclusions are not in any way to be regarded as officially recognized by the Indian Government. Fortunately, Mr. Tupper has adopted the historical method in treating his subject. He has not started with the old fashioned disquisition on the nature of government, or commenced with moral maxims on the duties of the governors to the governed. He has, instead, traced the gradual growth of the protected States in India, and shown the different theories of the relations between them and the Supreme Government which have at different times existed. By adopting this method he is enabled to prove that for many years there was no systematic principle underlying the connection between the British Government and the Native States. The relationship between suzerain and vassal existed, but the attributes belonging to the different parties were undefined. It is only during the twenty years which succeeded the Indian Mutiny in 1857 that our relations with the protected States were reduced to a system. This system Mr. Tupper terms Indian Political Law, and since international law is obviously unsuitable, and political has a definite connotation in India, political law may be considered an acceptable term. It is a pity that a word which bears an ambiguous meaning for European readers, however clear it is to Indian administrators, should have been adopted, but it is difficult to suggest a better term, and one ought not to blame Mr. Tupper for the poverty in the English language in this respect.

Mr. Tupper's book is devoted to an exposition of the history of the growth of Indian political law, to an analysis of Indian political conceptions before the British power became supreme, and to an examination of political law as at present administered in India. Each section of his book is extremely interesting. In tracing the growth of the English Protectorate he shows himself extremely fair. He has to treat of subjects like the annexation of Oudh and Lord Dalhousie's "Doctrine of Lapse," on which accredited thinkers are still at issue; and though he regards these questions from the official point of view, he shows more justice to those opposed to him than most writers on the subjects. But it is the second section of his book which contains the most valuable contributions to our knowledge. He there proves that our Indian Protectorate is not a purely western innovation, but is consonant with Indian ideas. In the third section, where he treats of Indian political law as it at present exists, Mr. Tupper has endeavoured to define the constitutional position of the Native States in India and the recognized limits of British interference.

The most interesting chapter of Mr. Tupper's book to Indian readers will be Chapter xvii, which treats of "Some Advantages of Native Rule." That an English civilian in India should admit that there are any advantages in Native rule shows how wide is the difference between the Englishman of to-day

and Lord Dalhousie. Dalhousie, despite what his latter-day apologists may say, believed that it would be for the good of the Indian peoples that the whole country should be under direct British rule. He could not see any advantage in maintaining the existence of Native States. But, as Mr. Tupper shows, there are very real reasons at present why inhabitants of India should prefer to be administered by Native Princes. Among other reasons, he points out the advantage of the permanence of the official staff in Native States, the absence of departmentalism, the absence of rigidity in collecting the land revenue, and the advantages of exemption from our legislation. Now that, owing to our supremacy, actual oppression of the people is made difficult, if not impossible, there is a tendency for Indian people to emigrate into Native States in order to be ruled by Native methods, which is fully shown by the results of the last Census.

The subject which Mr. Tupper treats is one of the greatest importance. For a long time the different races of India preferred to dwell in British Districts; now they are showing a tendency to prefer to dwell in Native States. This should make our administrators in India reflect. Can they not learn a lesson from the administration of the Native States, and understand that the larger employment of the more permanent Native officials is regarded as an advantage by the people of India? This is one lesson to be drawn from Mr. Tupper's book; there are many others which I have not space to dwell upon.

The Voice of India:
SELECTIONS FROM THE INDIAN PRESS.

THE RESOLUTION FOR SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

THE news that the motion to hold the Indian Civil Service Examinations simultaneously in England and in India was carried by eighty-four against seventy-six votes, will no doubt be received with pleasure throughout India by our countrymen. The Government was against the measure, and Mr. Russell in opposing the motion said that the gift of governing had not been vouchsafed to the particular class of the Indian population who probably best succeed in competitive examinations, and that the best possible education for the governors of India was imparted under English influences at English schools and colleges. The allusion in the first part of Mr. Russell's remarks is clear, and there can be no mistaking about its meaning. Although the resolution has been carried, it does not mean it will be adopted. But even if it is not, a step has been gained. We are, however, not over-sanguine about the matter. Although we recognise the force of Mr. Russell's remarks about the importance of the training imparted by English colleges and universities, we cannot at the same time conceal that it is too hard to require Indian students to go all the way to England and study there for years in order to qualify themselves for the Civil Service of their own country. The restrictions at present imposed on our countrymen are indeed hard, and anything that is done to lessen their rigour cannot but be welcome. Although we should naturally rejoice over anything that would tend to give our countrymen a larger share of the higher offices in the public service, we are not likely to wink at the dangers that may lurk in the proposal, and of which Mr. Russell gave a hint in this speech. It cannot be denied that when examinations for the Civil Service are also held in India the largest number of candidates will be furnished by Bengal, and the result will be the overflooding of the Covenanted Civil Service with Bengalis—a calamity the very thought of which would drive the Sikhs and Mussalmans of Upper India mad. For success in competitive examinations far different qualifications are needed than for governing a country like India. The Hindus of the Punjab might after a time be able to get one or two appointments in a year; but during the first few years they would fare quite as bad as the Sikhs and Mussalmans. We do not wish to be misunderstood in the matter. We hold that the Punjabis are not intellectually behind Bengalis in anything. Our best graduates have competed with Bengal's best graduates, and more than once beaten them.—*Punjab Patriot* (Lahore).

This question has been the theme of earnest agitation in this country. It was the one question which in 1878 brought all India together, and practically demonstrated the feasibility of united action in political matters by the educated community throughout the Empire. Again, in 1884, it formed the subject of the most widely spread agitation on record. It has formed the topic of discussion at every meeting of the Congress. The Public Service Commission took up the question, recorded evidence upon it, and then, strangely enough, voted against it, in the face of the clearest evidence to the contrary. We showed in a recent article that, if the Public Service Commission at all allowed itself to be guided by the weight of evidence, it should have decided in favour of simultaneous examinations. Of the witnesses examined throughout India, 361 were in favour of holding simultaneous examinations, 163 were against it, and 73 were doubtful about the matter. The weight of evidence was thus clearly in favour of simultaneous examinations; and yet the Commission decided against it. Fortunately Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji never lost sight of the question from the time of his entry into Parliament. He has asked many questions; he has framed a Bill; and now the principle contained in the Bill has been accepted, and one more instance of grievous wrong has been blotted out of the pages of Indian history by the wisdom of Parliament. To us it is a marvel that this concession was not made earlier. The youth of Ceylon are not compelled to go to England to compete for the Ceylon Civil Service. Batavia is a Dutch colony. It is said to be a misgoverned colony; yet the Dutch do not compel their Batavian subjects to travel all the way to Holland to qualify themselves for the Civil Service of their own country. Our countrymen must feel deeply grateful to Mr. Herbert Paul for having successfully carried his motion in favour of simultaneous examinations through Parlia-

ment. The motion was carried by eighty-four votes against seventy-six. The smallness of the majority is immaterial. The first Reform Bill of 1832 was carried by a majority of only one. The Government, it is said, opposed the motion. But the Government could not have been very hearty in its opposition. For, if it really was anxious that the motion should be rejected, it could easily have mustered its majority. It did not even care to secure a full House. The Under-Secretary, no doubt, opposed the motion. He is reported to have said that "the "gift of governing has not been vouchsafed to a "particular class of Indian population, who probably "best succeed in competitive examinations, and that "the best possible education for the governors of "India was imparted under English influences, at "English schools and colleges; and he, therefore, "deprecated any hasty decision in the matter." There is a hit against the Bengalees in the above passage, to which we need not refer further than to say that the Bengalees who have been successful in the competitive examinations have been tried as administrators, and have not been found wanting. The remark has on it the stamp of the India Office, which, deriving its inspiration from Simla, is necessarily jealous of the Bengalees. But the statement of the Under Secretary proves a little too much. If the governors of India are to be taken only from English schools and colleges, then it should be ruled that no native of India should be allowed to appear at the competitive examination who has not passed a certain number of years in a school or college in England. Such a rule would be inadmissible. A proposal of this kind would be regarded as monstrous. But whether the Government is in favour of Mr. Paul's motion or is opposed to it, it must now submit. The mandate of Parliament is omnipotent. Ere long simultaneous examinations will be held in India as well as in England. An unwonted impetus will be afforded to the educational movement in this country. To Mr. Herbert Paul and to those who voted with him on this occasion our acknowledgments are due. They have rendered a service which will never die out of the recollections of the people of India. They have redressed a great wrong; they have remedied a grievance which was the source of keen dissatisfaction. They have not only vindicated the honour of their Sovereign and the good name of their country, but have added to the contentment of the people and the stability of British rule in India. —*The Bengalee* (Calcutta).

On Monday evening even the most sanguine amongst us was rather surprised to hear the glad news that on the 2nd June the House of Commons, by 84 against 76 votes, passed the resolution of Mr. Paul declaring to hold Indian Civil Service Examinations simultaneously in England and India. The motion was opposed by the Ministry. On the following day, in reply to several questions as to what action the Government will take on this resolution, Mr. Gladstone said, the matter being very important, he will take three or four days before declaring the intentions of the Government. Such glorious acts on the part of the British people have endeared them to the Indians, and it is this justice, generosity, and noble-mindedness that has convinced Indians that, however great may be the obstacles in their way, the moment we reach the English people and tell them our grievances, real justice will be done to us. The whole country will anxiously wait for the decision of Mr. Gladstone.—*The Advocate* (Lucknow).

Both Mr. Paul, M.P., and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji have done a good stroke of business. When the latter some time ago gave notice that he would move the House of Commons to sanction the holding of simultaneous examinations in India and England for the posts in the Indian Civil service, we here little expected that Mr. Dadabhai would obtain a favourable hearing from the House. That announcement was followed by the declaration on the part of the Ministry that they were not in favour of Mr. Dadabhai's view. But the House has been won over so far. Mr. Paul, who is a member of the British Committee of the Indian Congress and has shown that he takes deep and sympathetic interest in Indian affairs, made the motion, and it was adopted by eighty-four votes against seventy-six. This is encouraging. It is true that the mere adoption of the motion does not mean everything. The principle which the House has accepted by a majority of eight votes has to be embodied in a Bill, which, again, has to be introduced into the House and so on. This can only be done with success, if the Government are favourably disposed. But Mr. Gladstone, questioned on the subject, has taken time to consider what the Government should do. The Government of India, it seems, will be consulted, and the matter is likely to lead to correspondence between the authorities here and the India Office. The ball is now set rolling. One effect of Mr. Paul's motion will be that it will bring the question within the range of practical politics; and sooner or later the change advocated by Mr. Paul and Mr. Dadabhai will have to be adopted. They are working in the right spirit and they have done well to bring the question into prominence. It cannot rest now.—*Subodh Patrika* (Bombay).

It can easily be imagined how much the Civil Service question has advanced at one bound by the passing of Mr. Paul's motion. While it was formerly a mere stock grievance of the Indian people, it is now become a practical difficulty to the Government of India. Up to this time all Indian authorities were deadly opposed to holding simultaneous examinations, because they clearly saw that the step would at once destroy the monopoly of higher posts in India which they have hitherto enjoyed. Even the Public Service Commission declined to recommend the measure notwithstanding the estimony of several important witnesses and the unanimous demand of native public opinion. All the controversy, however, has been brushed off in a moment, as it were, and the question is now reduced to the simple alternative whether the Resolution passed by a majority of the House of Commons should prevail or not over the selfish desires of Indian authorities; that is, in other words, whether the British Parliament or the Government of India are to be ultimate judges in matters of this sort. The question is quite easy to solve, inasmuch as all Indian authorities from the Secretary of State down-

wards are declared to be mere servants and in every way bound to respect the decision of the House of Commons. Anglo-Indian publicists in this country are naturally alarmed at Friday's success, and have already begun to minimise its importance by calling it a catch-vote, and advising Government to ignore it, just as they did on two previous occasions. The precedents cited are however unfortunate. On the Opium question Government had to eat humble pie, while the C. D. Acts Resolution has resulted in the appointment of a Committee which, both the Government of India and the military authorities are probably cursing in their hearts. The Government are now therefore grown wiser and know that it is not safe to pigeon-hole a resolution of the House of Commons as their short-sighted advisers in the press recommend. Fortunately the Government in England is at present controlled by a statesman, who has always been known to be extremely jealous of the prestige of Parliament, and who will, therefore, never allow any step which has the least colour of being unconstitutional. The replies given by Mr. Gladstone to the several questions on the subject put to him during the week, show that whatever the previous opinion of the Government be, he is fully determined to preserve the sanctity of the resolution passed. On Thursday night he stated that Mr. Paul's resolution had been forwarded to the Government of India for consideration and report as to how the regulations and limitations can be enforced. This means that the question of simultaneous examinations is no longer an open one; and the only thing now to be considered is under what conditions and restrictions they are to be held. The proper course for Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji would now be to shelve his Bill altogether, which is no longer needed, and be continually pressing the State Secretary to expedite the decision. The Government of India are no doubt put in a very sad plight; but they have to thank themselves for it. It is worth while here to note the inconsistency of those official advocates who are now making much of the adverse opinion of the Public Service Commission. If the recommendations of the Commission were entitled to so much weight as to be set above the Resolution of the House of Commons even, why did not the Government of India follow them *in toto?* As a matter of fact, Government accepted only such of the Commission's recommendations as were advantageous, and quite ignored those that were inconvenient. The argument, therefore, if reduced to a logical syllogism, amounts to this. The opinion of the Commission is weightier than the opinion of Parliament; but the opinion of Indian officials is still more weighty and can supercede the former. *A fortiori*, Government of India are superior individually and bodily to the Parliament of the United Kingdoms! We wish Anglo-Indian publicists will not descend to such absurdities for the sake of defending class monopolies.—*The Mahratta* (Poona).

The first meeting of the enlarged Bombay Legislation Council was held at Poona on 28th July last, when the Financial Statement for the year 1893-94 was made, and many important questions were put.

The Voice of Britain on India:

SELECTIONS FROM THE BRITISH PRESS ON INDIAN MATTERS.

Exeter Hall enthusiasts who wish to prohibit the use of opium without knowing anything whatever about the subject, will be shocked this morning to hear that a memorial has been issued by the British Indian Native Association, protesting against the Opium Commission, which, it declares, is merely the outcome of a well-meaning but misguided philanthropy. According to Reuter the memorial affirms that "the use of opium is universal in India, that "the drug is an absolute necessity and not a luxury, "and that its prohibition would inflict the greatest "hardship upon the population, and would cause "widespread discontent. The prohibition, it is "further contended, would not affect the use of "opium in China, and would result in increased "taxation and a budget deficit which would amount "to more than the country could bear." Those two sentences state the case exactly, and it is very difficult to see how any man, who is in the remotest degree conversant with the facts, can affect to believe otherwise. And be it noted that this expression of opinion is not the official view. The British Indian Native Association may be looked upon as representing non-official and public sentiment as much as any native organisation may. However, there is little need for fear that the Commission will cause a social and financial upheaval in India. Its members are reasonable men, and some of them, for the first time, will become acquainted with details previously unknown to them, so that even a minority report should not be forthcoming.—*The Sun*, August 24th.

The promptitude and moderation of the Bombay millowners, whatever may be the ultimate result, contrasts favourably with the rumours which have reached us from other parts of India. Of such rumours one of the most foolish was the widely-spread belief in a "conspiracy" by the exchange banks to defeat the efforts of the Government to maintain the rupee at 1s. 4d. It scarcely required the conclusive disclaimer in our Money Market report to expose a puerility of this sort. The truth is that on the exchange banks devolves the task of practically finding out whether a one-and-fourpenny rupee is a possibility or not. Hitherto, in spite of the Secretary of State holding back his drafts, it has not been possible, except in the first flush of excitement upon the closing of the mints. Meanwhile, a condition of things not unattended with danger to the future position of the Secretary of State's Indian drafts in the London Money Market is arising. The exchange banks have for the past month learnt to do their Indian business without the help of the Secretary of State's drafts. If this condition of things were to become chronic the Indian Government would pay dearly for its present experiment. But several circumstances not of a permanent character have contributed to strengthen the banks in their independent attitude during the past few weeks. Midsummer is

naturally one of the slack seasons in the exchange year with India. The curtailment of cotton exports to the silver-using countries of Eastern Asia, and for a moment the almost total suspension of that trade, have reduced the balance payable to India. It appears also, although it is difficult to obtain complete evidence on the subject, that a considerable flow of capital has set in from India to England during the past month. A very large number of cautious investors in India seem to be doubtful as to whether the rupee can be maintained at 1s. 4d., and are only too glad to seize the opportunity of remitting their savings at an exchange approaching to that rate. The immediate effect of the closing of the Indian mints was to drive down the value of silver in the open market to about a shilling per rupee. What its ultimate effect will be when the scarcity of coinage begins to produce the results on which the Indian Government mainly relies, no prudent man ventures to predict.—"Indian Affairs," *The Times*, 7th August.

Unhappily, the chief danger of such vituperation does not lie even in foolish epithets of this sort. At the present moment the Indian Government, with its new and partially representative councils, has to face a widely spread popular complaint to which it cannot altogether refuse its own sympathy. That complaint amounts to a charge that the finances of India, both on the side of revenue and expenditure, are being administered under Parliamentary pressure, with a view less to the interests of India than of England. The popular form which this complaint takes is that India is being driven into insolvency by prohibiting her to levy import duties on the one hand and by unfairly saddling her with military home charges on the other. A moderate import tariff, not with any view to protection, but solely for purposes of revenue, has, in the opinion of the majority of the native and British communities in India who think about such questions at all, and of many of the responsible officials, become a financial necessity. They hold that the absence of such a tariff compels recourse to other forms of taxation which bear grievously on the people; practically to the income-tax and the salt-tax. The Government of India was confessedly driven into its currency experiment by the absence of any other alternative except these two most odious of imposts. The fact that the Indian Government is unable to raise fresh taxation, having its hands tied by the Manchester party in Parliament as regards import duties, was insisted on both by Lord Herschell's Committee in England, and by the Viceroy in his remarkable speech to the Legislative Council at Simla.—"Indian Affairs," *The Times*, August 22nd.

The Council of India, composed as it is of retired Anglo-Indians, strives hard to live up to its reputation for backwardness and obstruction. It has just perpetreted a masterpiece of perversity and superciliousness in the high Anglo-Indian manner. It will be remembered that the House of Commons, on June 2nd last, resolved "that all open competitive "examinations, heretofore held in England alone, "for appointments to the Civil Service of India "shall henceforth be held simultaneously both in "India and England, such examinations in both "countries being identical in their nature, and all "who compete being classified in one list, according "to merit." This resolution, together with the draft despatch he proposed to transmit with it to the Governor-General of India in Council, Lord Kimberley in due course submitted to the Council of India. In his despatch Lord Kimberley requested the Government of India to examine the subject and to inform him in what mode, in their opinion, and under what conditions and limitations the resolution could be carried into effect. He even explicitly invited them to give unfettered expression to their opinion, and mentioned only one absolutely essential condition of any admissible scheme, namely, "that "an adequate number of the members of the Civil "Service shall always be Europeans." A hostile critic, indeed, might very readily discern in the despatch a reflection of the official and Tory opposition to the resolution in the House, and pick a quarrel with the Secretary of State for hinting to the Government of India the desirability of raising difficulties to the practical execution of the intentions of the Commons. The Council of India, however, were evidently in no need of any such suggestion. . . . . Sir John Strachey, pressed by the bogey of natives ousting Englishmen, uses language equally uncomplimentary to his judgment and to his taste. "To "whom," he asks, "is this power and responsibility "to be transferred? Not, to use the words of the "Act of 1870, to natives of India of proved merit "and ability, ... but to men chosen from a class "infinitesimally small in proportion to the population, "a class intellectually acute, but composed almost "entirely of the very feeblest element of the people "of the vast continent of India; of men who are "looked upon by the more vigorous and politically "important races as being as much foreigners as "ourselves." We have nothing but praise for the Act of 1870. But does Sir John not see that the real point of difference is simply a matter of rupees? For, if these "feeble" creatures could only raise the money to bring them over here for a couple of years of study, they would go into the service under the existing system precisely as they would do more cheaply under the resolution. The whole of the arguments of these six minutes are instinct with dread lest the natives of India should get their hands further into the administration of their own country. It is a patriotic, panic inducing, judicial blindness. The Government of India, we hope, will be better advised than to meet the resolution and despatch with such a blank *non possumus*. We want the services of the pick of the youth both of England and India in the arduous duties of Indian administration, and the resolution is calculated to operate powerfully in favour of the surer attainment of that most desirable consummation. At the same time it cannot fail to give an immense impetus to the expansion of the higher education in India. This result may not come home so forcibly to ourselves as it undoubtedly will to Indian educationists. But it is easy enough to perceive how fundamentally such a brightening of the hopes of the natives may contribute to the regeneration of India, by stimulating the energy of the ambitious youth into lines of solid study, and by widening the gates to a career in the imperial service.

Everything depends upon an honest execution of the mandate of the House, and it will be for the friends of India—and of England—to watch jealously over the operation of the new arrangement.—*Daily Chronicle*, July 31st.

Gossip.

ABOUT PERSONS AND BOOKS.

Lady Canning's letters and journals written during the Mutiny will form the greater part of the second volume of "A Story of two Noble Lives," which is to be published in October by Mr. George Allen.

Sir Richard Temple has in the press a volume entitled "Life in Parliament," a record of his daily experiences in the House of Commons from 1886 to 1892.

Mr. Vincent Smith, of the Indian Civil Service, has contributed an interesting letter on recent archæological discoveries in India to *The Academy* of 5th August.

General regret is expressed in Bombay and throughout India at the untimely death, at the age of sixteen, of the only son of Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy, Bart., C.S.I., C.I.E.

Mr. Avadh Behari Lal, the author of a "Poem "on Her Majesty the Queen-Empress's Jubilee" and of "Juvenile Effusions," has written an interesting ode on the marriage of the Duke and Duchess of York.

The second number of *The Chaitanya Library Journal* contains a remarkable article on "The "Origins of the Vernacular Literature of Hindu-"stan," by that well-known authority Mr. G. A. Grierson, and other interesting contributions.

The fifth volume of the "Calendar of State "Papers — Colonial series: East Indies and "Persia," covers the period from 1630 to 1634, one of the most critical periods in the early history of the East India Company.

Messrs. W. and A. Keith Johnston, the well-known map publishers of Edinburgh, have in preparation an "Atlas of India," with letterpress, historical and statistical, by Sir W. W. Hunter. It will contain sixteen plates of maps and plans of cities, with an index of names.

BIBLIOGRAPHY of ARTICLES in MONTHLY and QUARTERLY MAGAZINES on INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "Review of Reviews,")
with additions.

SEPTEMBER, 1893.

Bankers' Magazine (85, London Wall). Palgrave, R. H. Inglis, "Silver and the Indian Government."

Blackwood's Magazine (37, Paternoster Row). "The Indian Currency Commission."

Board of Trade Journal (Eyre and Spottiswoode). "The Indian Tea Trade."

Calcutta Review (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.). Johnston, Charles, "Curio-Hunting in a Bengal Bazaar;" Shumbhoo Chunder Dé, "Hooghly, Past and Present;" Sarat Chandra Mitra, "The Broadley Sculptures in the Indian Museum;" Cust, R. N., "The Indo-Chinese Opium Question as it Stands in 1893;" "Dupleix — The Siege of Pondicherry in 1748;" Hope, C. W., "The Dehra Dún."

Church Missionary Intelligencer (Salisbury Square, E.C.). Clarke, C. W. A., and Tanner, H. J., "Fifty Years Work in an Indian Public School."

Edinburgh Review (Longmans and Co.). "The Campaign in the Kanjut Valley."

Godey's Magazine (376, Strand). Cadman, S. P., "The Luther of India: Buddha Gautama."

Indian Journal of Education (Madras). "Public Instruction in Mysore, 1891-92;" "Madras Athletic Association;" "Madras University Examiners, etc., 1893-94."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14 Parliament Street, S.W.). Sir Raymond West, K.C.I.E., "The Criminal Law and Procedure of the Ancient Hindus compared with Modern Systems"; Jas. B. Knight, C.I.E., "Deccan College Lectures"; S. H. Mirza, "Sinat-i-Hal"; R. Harvey, "Travancore: Its Annual Administration Report for 1891-2."

Investors' Review (Longmans & Co.). "An Indian Lunacy."

Juridical Review (Stevens and Haynes). Macdougall, J. W., "Land Tenure in India."

Lucifer (7, Duke Street, Adelphi). Edge, S. V., "Pilgrim Glimpses of India."

Missionary Review of the World (44, Fleet Street). Mateer, Rev. S., "A Romish View of the British Indian Government;" Kennedy, J., "The Present Aspect of Missions in India."

National Review (W. H. Allen and Co.). Houldsworth, Sir W. H., "Closing the Indian Mints."

Newbery House Magazine (Griffith, Farran and Co.). Pugh, S. S., "Buddha and His Gospel."

New Review (Longmans, Green and Co.). Temple, Sir Richard, Bart., "The Silver Crisis in India."

Nineteenth Century (Sampson Low). Curzon, Hon. G. N., "India Between Two Fires."

United Service Magazine (15, York Street, Covent Garden). Adam, Capt. F. A., "Sir Charles Napier's Indian Orders;" Clarke, H. Stanley, "The Oudh Police."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "Publishers' Circular.")
with additions.

SEPTEMBER, 1893.

Currency Question (The): Report of the Herschell Committee; Proceedings in the Imperial Legislative Council; Speeches by the Viceroy, Sir David Barbour, and the Hon. J. L. Mackay: Verbatim Report. (Allahábád: The Pioneer Press.) .... 1 Rs.

Forrest, G. W. .... "Selections from the Letters, Despatches, and other State Papers, Preserved in the Military Department of the Government of India, 1857-58." Vol. I. (Calcutta: Military Department Press.) ....

Malleson, Col. G. B., C.S.I. .... "Lord Clive and the Establishment of the English in India" ("Rulers of India" Series). (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.) .... 2s. 6d.

Marshman, J. C., C.S.I. .... "Abridgment of the History of India." Third edition. (Edinburgh: Blackwood.) .... 6s. 0d.

Mitter, P. C. .... "The Spoilt Child: A Tale of Hindu Domestic Life." Translated by G. D. Oswell. (London: Thacker and Co.) .. 4s. 6d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85 Palace Chambers, London, S.W.